



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06912362 2

.

.

1

CHURCH ESTABLISHMENTS

DEFENDED,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE

TO

THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

BY THE

REV. C. J. BROWN,

MINISTER OF ANDERSTON CHAPEL.

"Blessed be the Lord God of our fathers, which hath put such a thing as this in the King's heart, to beautify the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem."—EZRA VII. 27.

GLASGOW:

M. OGLE, 1, ROYAL EXCHANGE SQUARE;

WAUGH AND INNES, W. WHYTE AND CO.,

R. OGLE, EDINBURGH; JAMES NISBET, JAMES BURNES,

LONDON; W. CURRY AND CO., DUBLIN;

A. BROWN AND CO., ABERDEEN.

MDCCCXXXIII.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

152673

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
1899

GLASGOW:

FULLARTON & CO., PRINTERS, VILLAFIELD.

ADVERTISEMENT.

FOR the delay which has taken place in the publication of this treatise since it was first advertised, the Author has only to plead, in apology to his friends, the unforeseen extent of the work, together with professional engagements.

There is one subject connected with the question of Church Establishments, which the Author has purposely abstained from handling, partly on account of its extent, and partly because the argument is quite independent of it. He refers to Church Property, the origin of which, together with its true nature and relation to property in general, would afford materials for a work of much interest and importance at the present time.

GLASGOW, 18th May, 1833.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS,	1
CHAPTER I.—On the Union of Church and State in general,	5
CHAPTER II.—On the particular Union subsisting in the case of the Church of Scotland,	
Introductory Remarks,	42
SECTION I.—On the Scripture authority for a National Endowment of the Church,	43
SECTION II.—On the Expediency of a Nation- al Endowment of the Church,	143
SECTION III.—On the alleged injustice of en- dowing the Church of Scotland exclusively, and requiring other bodies to contribute to its support,	217
Concluding remarks on two popular objections,	230
Appendix,	233

CHURCH ESTABLISHMENTS

DEFENDED.

INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS.

It requires but little penetration to see that mere controversy will not place our Church Establishment beyond the reach of danger. The Church of Scotland must advance in that reformation of abuses which she has begun, and which, thanks be to God, she has the power of carrying on, if faithful to herself. Her ministers must steadily pursue their work of faith and labour of love; coming cheerfully forward, at the same time, to own, or rather to search out whatever evils may have crept into the administration of the Church; and having it for their honest desire and determination to remove these, not only in order to save themselves from public disapprobation, but from a sense of duty to Christ, love to the souls of men, and repentance for past misimprovement of privileges. A course like this, it might well be hoped, would conciliate the affections of all who have their country's good at heart. At

all events, it would do what is more important ; would avert from us that displeasure of the great Head of the Church, which, incurred as it has been by course of defection from his cause, has long been manifesting itself in spiritual judgments upon the land, and may be expected to issue in temporal judgments, except we unfeignedly return to Him from whom we have revolted.

It is no less clear, however, that if we were unable to lay a basis of sound principle and argument at the bottom of practical measures, these were altogether contemptible and useless. They could serve only as a temporary blind to conceal the hollowness of a bad cause. Happily, there are few questions on which we have less reason for wishing to decline controversy than the question of Church Establishments ; and it is a matter of congratulation that, amidst the evils to which the present agitation will give rise, it will produce at least this good effect, that many who have hitherto neglected the study of a subject of much practical importance, taking for granted what they should have been able to prove, will now feel compelled to bring the apostolic precept to bear upon it,—“ Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good.”

There are *two* grounds on which the enemies of our Church Establishment can take their stand :—

First, *that all union of Church and State is unjustifiable ; and,*

Secondly, *that, supposing all union between Church and the State were not unjustifiable, the union which subsists in the case of the Church of Scotland is so.*

I apprehend that it is of considerable importance in this controversy to view these grounds distinctly. Our opponents have not a little darkened the whole question, by passing insensibly, and leading us to pass insensibly, from the one to the other. They take up, for example, the former ground,—that all union between Church and State is unjustifiable. They tell us that the Church is a spiritual society, in her nature wholly diverse from the kingdoms of the world; and that every sort of alliance, therefore, between her and the State is antichristian, and savours of Rome. Now, it is very evident that this mode of argument either determines the whole question, or it determines nothing. If all union of Church and State be unlawful, our establishment is unlawful of course, and ought to come down. But if not—if there be any one instance or kind of union between the Christian Church and the State which is not unlawful—then they ought to abandon the first ground altogether, and confine themselves to the second, which respects the justifiableness of the particular union subsisting in our case. The truth is, that the former ground is so utterly untenable that, unless by being mixed up with the other, it cannot be maintained with the least plausibility. Instead, however, of arguing it fairly out,—either defending the position on its own merits, or abandoning it,—we find our opponents gliding away to something which belongs to the second ground, and which perhaps involves greater difficulty; and thus the reader is prevented from seeing clearly what he would otherwise perceive at once, that the first position is not only incapable of defence, but goes in the face of the most obvious and

fundamental principles of religion, and ought to be detested by every good man. I propose, then, to take up this point,—the union of Church and State *in general*, in the first place.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN GENERAL, SHOWING THAT THEIR UNION IN SOME SHAPE IS NOT ONLY NOT UNJUSTIFIABLE, BUT MATTER OF ABSOLUTE OBLIGATION, &c.

It will not, I presume, be denied that Civil Rulers are the "ministers of God,"* and are responsible to him for the right discharge of their office; that they are bound to acknowledge his authority, and seek his blessing in their whole proceedings; and that only through Christ the Mediator, God is to be approached, or his blessing sought by sinful men. Our argument is not with men bold enough to deny statements like these. †

* See Rom. xiii. 1-6.

† It may not be improper to observe here, once for all, that the doctrine of Civil Rulers being the "ministers of God," neither affects nor is affected by the particular mode in which they may happen to be appointed. Whatever may be the *proximate* source of the Ruler's power, his office is ordained of God for the good of society; and he, in some manner, derives his commission *ultimately* from the Supreme Ruler,—a commission, not, of course, to do wrong, or to govern for his own pleasure and interests, but faithfully to discharge the duties of his office to the good of that society over which he is placed. This is the doctrine of the Word of God; and, while it is in perfect harmony with the light of nature, it lies in the golden mean between the odious claims of selfish despotism, and the impious, absurd, and ruinous theory that makes the opinions and will of man the ultimate standard of his duty.

Well ; it is taken for granted, that legislators may not lawfully proceed to transact the nation's affairs, without acknowledging the authority and seeking the blessing of God—the authority and the blessing not of God considered absolutely, but of God in Christ ; in other words, without acknowledging the authority of the Lord Jesus, and his mediation, as the alone channel through which a blessing from God is to be sought in all affairs whatever. But if our opponents concede this, they concede as real a union of Church and State as can possibly exist. Surely it is impossible for the most refined ingenuity to separate the *Church*, or kingdom of the Lord Jesus from Christ himself, and his mediation, and blessing flowing from that mediation, and obtained through due acknowledgment of it. Yet all these must be brought into most close conjunction with the whole system of legislation, if rulers would not set themselves in opposition to the express commands of Christ, and the general tenor and spirit of gospel duty. Produce us a text of the New Testament, say our opponents, for the Union of Church and State. We answer, that the whole Scriptures together, not only permit but demand it. They demand it by enjoining that Christian men, in whatever sphere they may be called to move—in private and in public, in the Church and in the State—shall seek to carry the authority and the blessing of their Master along with them, and in his name, conduct their whole proceedings. The following words of an Apostle do but embody the general spirit of Christian duty : “ Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord

Jesus, giving thanks to God even the Father by him." Surely no man will have the presumption to allege that the "whatsoever" here has nothing to do with the acts of Christian rulers, done by them in their official character. If, indeed, it were unlawful for a Christian, in any case, to become a civil ruler, then the "whatsoever" of this Christian precept, could have nothing to do with the acts of Magistrates. But if a Christian *may* lawfully enter the office of a Magistrate, thither, beyond a doubt, does this precept follow him, requiring, that "whatsoever he do in word or deed, he do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God even the Father by him." It is, of course, not asserted, that this passage requires the offering up of solemn and formal prayer in connection with every action, however trifling; although it does, I think, plainly require that, while in all affairs, reference more or less general, habitual and implied, if not actual and express, be made to the authority of Christ, express and solemn reference shall be made to it by thanksgiving and prayer, in affairs which are of peculiar moment, such as are the proceedings of legislative assemblies. But it matters little to the argument whether even this be conceded or not. If our opponents concede that Christian legislators may not lawfully proceed to transact the national affairs, without acknowledging, in some way or other, *and in connection with these affairs*, the authority of the Lord Jesus, and his mediation as the channel through which alone they are warranted to seek a blessing from God; then, I repeat, they concede as real a conjunction of Church and State as can possibly exist.

The truth is, that to bring the State and its assemblies into union with *Christ and his mediation*, is a far more unequivocal declaration of the union of the State with the kingdom of Christ, than the mere circumstance of an agreement entered into by the State with a particular visible Church, or Church Court. For I can conceive, that the State might enter into such an agreement, as a mere matter of expediency, without recognising the kingdom of Christ as a real kingdom,—without believing in Christ at all. But so soon as you concede the obligation of the State to connect its laws with Christ himself and his mediation, you concede the *principle* of the union of Christ's kingdom with the State. From henceforth, the only question that can be moved on the subject is, How the conjunction ought to operate,—what ought to be the *mode* of it,—what are the fruits that naturally arise out of it?

But I observe, *farther*, that *in so far as the laws of Christianity may be applicable to the matters before them*, Legislators dare not lay aside the authority of these laws, but are bound to observe them in exercising their civil office. Let this proposition only be understood, and it cannot fail to be assented to. It in fact amounts to no more than this, that the laws of Christ are binding on his disciples in all places and situations. Now, it is plain that there are various matters about which *Christian* rulers must be called to legislate, on which the laws of Christ have an important bearing. I might instance wars,—oaths administered on solemn occasions,—the protection of the Sabbath,—the education of

youth,—the offering up of prayers to God in the senate for a blessing on its proceedings,—and so forth. “*I never heard a question canvassed in the House of Commons,*” (said a member of the late Parliament,*) “where Christianity did not furnish both a motive and an argument.” But if a legislator be bound to regulate his official acts by the laws of Christ, here is the union of Church and State. It is a legislator acting at the same time, and in reference to the very same acts, in the double capacity of a member of the State and a member of Christ’s kingdom, the Church; not acting in the capacity of a legislator only, or of a subject of Christ’s kingdom only, but avowedly acting in both capacities in connection with the same affairs. Let it be observed, that this is not the mere case of a Christian legislator *bringing the influence of his Christian character to bear on his acts in the senate, in order to give these weight.* But it is the case of a legislator avowedly acting in the senate as under obligation to legislate upon the footing of Christ’s laws, in all cases where these may be applicable,—to act as a subject of Christ’s kingdom and as a member of the State at the same time, and in reference to the same acts. If this be not, in the highest sense of the phrase, a union of the Church with the State,—of the Church as such, with the State as such,—I am unable to see how a union between these kingdoms can at all be constituted.

The truth is, that the duty of legislators to regulate their official conduct by the laws of Christ’s kingdom,

* Mr J. E. Gordon.

is a more unequivocal declaration of the alliance of Church and State, than the mere circumstance of a national endowment of the Church. If, indeed, the legislature places the endowment upon the footing of obedience to Christ, it then becomes an unequivocal declaration of the union in question, (although still, by the way, it is nothing more than *an exemplification* of the general duty of rulers to regulate their official acts by Christ's laws.) But I can conceive that the State may endow the Church, without any reference to the authority of Christ,—without so much as recognising the truth of his religion,—for mere reasons of political expediency. In France this is nearly the case in point of fact; the teachers of all religions being nationally endowed. In such a case there is nothing that can, with any propriety, be termed a union between the *Church of Christ* and the State. But so soon as you concede the obligation of rulers to legislate in the double capacity of members of the State, and subjects of the kingdom of Christ, you concede the *principle* of the union of Church and State. In what ways that principle shall then operate, is a distinct matter, and one which must of course remain to be determined by the wisdom of the legislature, acting under a sense of its duty at once to Christ and to the nation. Whether, for example, the principle shall operate in the way of endowing the Church,—of protecting her weekly Sabbath,—of punishing open acts of blasphemy,—of calling on Christian ministers to offer up prayers in the senate,—of appointing, or calling on the Church to appoint seasons of public humiliation and thanksgiving on suitable occasions,—of enjoining that the prin

principles of the Christian religion shall be taught in all national schools,—of affording facilities for promoting Christianity in the colonies, by occasional grants of money or otherwise,—of requiring that oaths administered on certain solemn occasions do recognise the day of final judgment, or “the faith of a Christian,”—of diminishing the number of oaths, because Christ has severely condemned the needless use of them,—of providing for the appointment of Christian ministers as chaplains for the army, navy, public hospitals, jails, &c.—whether, I say, the union of Church and State shall operate in any or all of these, or other like ways, it must lie with the Legislature to determine. But the principle of the union is thoroughly established, so soon as it is allowed to be the duty of legislators, in any instance to regulate their official acts by the laws of the kingdom of Christ.

Few things, I believe, have operated more powerfully in cherishing the notion, that Church and State, because of their diversity of nature, are incapable of any legitimate union, than the confounding of what the Scripture calls *the world*, or *the evil world*, with *the State*. Every one knows that “the world” is often used in Scripture to denote the mass of mankind considered as in a state of alienation from God, and subjection to the prince of darkness. It is needless to quote texts to this purpose,—they occur everywhere. Now the Church of Christ is a society not only distinct and different from the world taken in this sense, that is the evil world, but contrary to it in every respect. God is not the maker of the evil world any more than he is the author of sin : God is the Author,

the Father, the Builder of the Church. Satan is prince of the evil world: Christ is the King of the Church. The Church and the world, in short, are avowedly opposed in the character of their members in the principles by which they are governed, in their habits, maxims, pursuits and ultimate destination. It were preposterous, therefore, to imagine the existence of any recognised and avowed union between the Things which are distinct and mutually independent. They may be in various ways united: contraries admit of union. "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? What communion hath light with darkness? What concord hath Christ with Belial?"

A very silly and mischievous notion, however, has been taken up—not perhaps conceived in a very definite form, yet really taken up and propagated—when the Church is in Scripture put in opposition to the world, the world means, or at least includes, the State or civil government: and accordingly it is taken for granted, not only that the Church is a society distinct from the State, (this is quite true,) but a society opposite to it, and so of course as incapable of a legitimate, avowed union with it, as Christ is incapable of union with Belial. It may well seem strange how a notion so palpably groundless could ever have come to be entertained. That Satan and his adherents should willingly take advantage of it, is indeed nothing singular, since it plainly and directly tends to that consummation on which their hearts are set,—to the attainment of a liberty to carry on the affairs of earthly kingdoms apart from the authority, the Word, and the Anointed of the God with whom they are at enmity.

It is clear that as the Church is in declared and irreconcilable opposition to the world, and is commanded by God to come out from it, so, if the friends of God can only be prevailed upon to identify the world with the State or civil government, they will not need to be *expelled* from the State, with their Bible, and their Sabbath, and their Divine Master; for they will in that case be forced to banish *themselves*, in answer to the apostolic appeal, "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?" That some good men, however, have fallen into the notion, is doubtless owing, in a great measure, to the melancholy fact, that, in every age, civil government has been chiefly managed by men that did not fear God, who were manifestly of the world, and were either secret or avowed enemies to the cause of Christ. Hence it seems to have come to pass, by one of those arbitrary associations of thought which so often lead the human mind astray, that some have come to view civil governments, or states, as one and the same thing with that world to which the Church is in Scripture set in the strongest terms of opposition—so strong as to render the idea of an avowed connection between them a thing monstrous.

But whatever be the true origin of the notion, it is a groundless, impious, and mischievous device of Satan, against the government of God and the present peace and everlasting welfare of mankind. Civil government a part of the evil world!—when we read in every page of Scripture that it is an appointment of God for the good of mankind. How can civil rulers, considered as such, belong to the evil world,

when their proper character is declared to be that of men "fearing God, and hating covetousness,"—when they are declared to be ordained of God, and to be his "ministers for good" to their subjects,—when Christians are required to honour and submit to them for the Lord's sake? But it were a waste of time to pursue the proof of a thing so manifest. That civil rulers have very often been ungodly, is no more a proof that civil government belongs to the evil world, than it is a proof that the Church is of the world, because, in her present imperfect state, ungodly men often creep into her ministry and communion. Is it to be borne that civil government—the noble ordinance of God for the good of mankind which bears upon it such lively characters of the government of Jehovah himself, and by means of which it is, under Christ, that the Church is permitted to hold her assemblies, and conduct her ordinances unmolested—that this ordinance of God shall be set down as part and parcel of that world, from which Christians are commanded to separate themselves as from a thing unclean, and with which it were monstrous to attempt combining the name, and the holy laws, and the providence of God? Is it to be borne that civil government should thus be delivered over with all its mighty energies for good or evil, into the hands of Satan,—the Church foolishly leaving the world to take advantage of this childish pretence, or not polluting sacred things by mingling them with profane, in order to cast the laws of God out of the State and to carry on the whole business of government, a

re were no Scriptures, no Providence, no God
p *

e Church is opposite to the evil world, and
fore, cannot be combined with the evil world as

But the Church, though distinct from the
, is not opposite to it. On the contrary, both
Church and the State have God the Father, Son,
Spirit, as the fountain from which they flow.

are bound to take the moral law as the un-
g standard of their administrations. Both are
d to have the glory of God in view, as the
ate end of all their procedure, though they are
red to pursue that end in different ways. Both
act in harmony about a common object, without
one interfering with the other's rights, or sacri-
; its own independence. Nor is this all. We
by and by see, not only that the diverse nature of
kingdoms is not incompatible with union be-
n them, but that it is *just their diversity of na-*
which renders them capable of union without
ion or discord.

nce Christianity and religion are, with Christians,
ical,—since with them it is impossible to separate
ion from the peculiar doctrines and laws of the
ch or kingdom of Christ, it is not very difficult
e, that to maintain the unlawfulness of all union of

n Dr Wardlaw's Sermon on Civil Establishments of Chris-
r, I find an apposite example of the fallacy referred to, in the
ing words, p. 43, "Had the world let the Church alone,"
ring to the establishment of Christianity by *the State*, "the
ch would soon have subdued the world!" (that is, of course,
it world).

the State with *the Church*, is virtually to assert the unlawfulness of all union of the State with sacred things, with religion, with God. Accordingly, our opponents sometimes do not hesitate to express themselves to this purpose. In the famous sermon of Mr Marshall, (so much and so unaccountably gloried in by his Brethren,) we find the following passage: "This is our reply, and this reply we are ready to justify by the amplest discussion of the nature of civil government, as well as by appealing to a thousand facts—facts, I mean, demonstrative of *the mischief that arises from blending civil with sacred things.*"* In the speech of a learned Gentleman lately published under the sanction of the Edinburgh Voluntary Church Association, we find the following words: "Let us assist them to lay the foundation of the new policy firm and stable, because on just principles! to draw strongly and broadly the line of separation between Church and State, and to build up for posterity a noble and capacious edifice of freedom, within which all the interests, *civil and sacred*, may flourish without obstruction and *without intermingling.*"† The circumstance to be noted here is the anxiety of this Gentleman—an anxiety which I presume he shares with his friends,—that in the new "edifice" to be erected on firm, because on just principles, civil interests and sacred interests may flourish without *intermingling*. In general, however, the enemies of Establishments do not

* Sermon on Ecclesiastical Establishments, by the Rev. Andrew Marshall, Kirkintilloch. Edit. 7. p. 10.

† Substance of a Speech, &c., published by the Edinburgh Voluntary Church Association, 1832, p. 16.

nature to put their opinions forward in a form of which manifest impiety and absurdity. For the most part they avoid the express condemnation of all union between *religion* and the State, and confine themselves to the phrase "Church," which to unthinking minds is apt to convey the idea of something sectarian, and separable from true religion in general. It is not the less true, however, that there is no substantial difference between the one doctrine and the other. Unless true religion can be viewed as a thing separable from Christianity, or, in other words, separable from the doctrines and laws of the kingdom of Christ,—to separate the State from the *Church*, must be identical with separating the State from *religion*. But to disjoin the State from religion,—what is it but impiously to separate the ordinance of God from God himself, and to affirm that all reference to the name, providence, or word of God, made in the assemblies of the State, with the view of influencing their proceedings more or less, is irrelevant and unlawful? If it is unlawful, (as Mr Dick will have it) to allow "civil interests and sacred to intermingle;" if it is mischievous, (as according to Mr Marshall it is) "to blend civil with sacred things," then for a legislator to bring sacred things to the senate is as much out of order as it would be for him to introduce a dissertation about his family matters; nay, it is a thing to be reprobated. It would follow of course from this doctrine, that certain members of the late House of Commons, so far from doing wrong in opposing the recognition of the Divine Providence in the Cholera Bill, were taking the only course they could lawfully adopt, and deserved the

praise of the country (so far, at least, as respects the *substance* of their proceedings), in giving so direct an exposition of the "new policy to be laid forth as stable, because on *just* principles;" in drawing "strongly and broadly the line of separation between Church and State;" and in laying the foundation of that "noble and capacious edifice of freedom," which the mischief of *blending civil with sacred* is never to be perpetrated, but all the interests, civil and sacred, are destined to "flourish without obstruction and *without intermingling*."

It is marvellous that expressions so pathetically atheistical in their tendency, could have escaped any Christian man, even in the progress of a polemical harangue: but that they should have been repeated again and again on paper, as the proper language of his deliberate opinions, without exciting abhorrence;—that they should have been given in public, under the sanction of an association, numbered fourteen ministers of the Gospel among its officers;—that they should have found their way into the pulpit, sacred to the service of that God who said, "In *all* thy ways acknowledge him, and he will direct thy steps," and who pronounces all transgressions unlawful with which his sacred name, his providence, his blessing, and his Christ may be blended;—that they should have met with the approval or rather should not have called forth the detection of that assemblage of ministers in whose presence they were uttered;—in fine, that they should have had their appearance in no less than seven editions of the discourse where they first appeared,—all

not to say, indicates nothing less than most
le recklessness and blindness of mind.

again, we find the Rev. Dr Heugh, at the
a meeting lately held in Glasgow, to form
antary Church Society, speaking as follows:
explain this object" (the object of the Society)

ew words. We hold then, *that Christianity*
t to be the subject of civil legislation ; and, in
r, that civil legislation ought not to be employ-
force the support or the propagation of Chris-

* It is truly lamentable, to find this Reverend
an speaking with contempt of the scanty light
refathers, respecting the connection between
and State, while he is himself uttering opin-
once so absurd, and of a tendency so impious.
saying little to say, that, upon the principles of
gh, Christianity can form no part of any scheme
al education. I am content to refer it to any
f candour and common sense, whether it be pos-
sistently with order and propriety, to introduce
nity at all into legislative assemblies, with the
influencing their proceedings more or less, if it
oper that Christianity should in any case form
ject-matter of legislation. Let the Christian
of this country note the fact, that the men who
k to lead their minds, and who, in the pulpit,
their hearers to carry religion with them into
stations and relations in life, and to regard it
cteristic of hypocrites, that they confine their

Christianity to sacred places and sacred times—that these men glory in having it for their object to expunge Christianity, that is, religion, from the Statute-book,—which is just equivalent to banishing it from the Senate.

Alas ! who that has any reverence for the authority of Jehovah, love to the honour of his Son, or regard for the principles of truth and righteousness immutable amidst the sophistry and cavillings of men, can refrain from weeping over so lamentable a state of things as this ; when the very Ministers of God, set up for the purpose of asserting his authority, and of labouring to counteract the tendency of man's depraved mind to cast it off, are found leagued together to strengthen that very tendency,—“not knowing what they do.” Let them burn with shame to find a Christian layman taking the place which they have forsaken, and bearing that testimony to God and his authority before the world, which it was doubtless his duty to bear, but which it is the whole intention of their sacred office to lift up : “Gentlemen,” (said an honest, able, and Christian member of the late House of Commons, addressing the electors of Nottingham,) “I never could find a hiding place from the presence of the Deity in the British House of Commons ; nor did I ever hear a question canvassed in that house, where Christianity did not supply both a motive and an argument in the discussion.” These are the words of a man who was himself in the Senate, and who felt the responsibilities of that situation. Can they be read by any clergyman whose principles are not fast breaking up and going to

ay, without commending themselves at once to his science, and producing feelings of a very painful kind, when viewed in connection with the promulgation of doctrines like these—that “Christianity ought not to be the subject of human legislation,” and that there ought to be “no intermingling of civil with sacred interests?” But for a recklessness in the work of innovation which has rarely been equalled among the ranks of infidels, how could it fail to strike their minds, that there is not a government in all the civilized world whose authority is not based upon the religious solemnities of an *oath*—itself one of the highest acts of Divine worship? Religion not a fit subject of human legislation! The *Ruler*, at least, who imbibes this doctrine, shakes his office to its centre.

Really if it is come to this, these Gentlemen had much better speak out at once, and assert that Religion has no connection with the science of civil government, with the principles of legislation, with the qualifications that ought to be found in rulers, with the standard by which their proceedings should be regulated, or with the ends they should have in view in these proceedings. *Our* principle, on the contrary, is, —and we glory in speaking it fully and freely out—that there is nothing lawful with which Religion has no connection,—nothing lawful from which religion may lawfully be separated: and that the more influential upon human affairs and interests the thing is, so much the more thoroughly and avowedly must God’s authority, and providence, and glory be combined with it. We know this is not a doctrine which the *world* will relish, because it would not permit them

to carry on their affairs, as they desire to do, without God. "Cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us," is the language of the world now, as of old. 'Keep the Church to yourselves, and there pray and fear God, if you like. But what have you to do bringing God and his authority into the Senate, and into Cabinet councils? This is our ground. Keep your own ground, and we will not molest you.' But we protest that it is *not* your ground: the Senates, and Cabinet councils, and elections to the legislature, and civil laws, are all the property and the ordinances of God; and that he has not renounced his claim over them, because you and your ungodly neighbours have forgotten it, and sought to thrust him out, saying, with certain of old, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cord from us." We know well that we are bound by our Master's laws, to separate ourselves from the evil world. But the State is not the evil world: as we find no command to retire from the State, with our God and our Bible, leaving you to pursue your schemes, unmolested, to God's dishonour, and the country's ruin. As long as we are able, we will keep the ground; seeking, in obedience to the command of the Most High, to get rulers that shall not only prove themselves 'able men,' but such as 'fear God,' and will be prepared to manifest this, by their whole conduct in the Senate. And however little success we may at present have, the time we trust is approaching when, so far from having the State for your own proper ground, God will openly vindicate the possession of his own property, and drive you away with

ame, and fill every civil assembly with his own people, and "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ." *

If any one should feel disposed to ask, how all the monstrosities which I have described, can be the fair result of the separation of the Church from the State; since it is well known that Dr Wardlaw, the late Mr McGavin and others, who contend earnestly for that separation, are favourable to the legal protection of the Lord's Day, and that too as an ordinance of God made known in the Bible,—it will be no difficult matter to show that the views of these Gentlemen on this important subject are not only in palpable contradiction to their general principles, but so inconsistent with themselves, and self-destructive, as greatly to confirm, instead of invalidating, all that has been said respecting the nature, and ruinous effects of a separation of the Church from the State. It is, indeed, no wonder that good men, maintaining opinions in their nature so absurd and unchristian, should occasionally be driven by their better feelings to take refuge in contradiction, from the consequences of their own doctrines.

Dr Wardlaw evidently felt the difficulty in which his principles about the separation of Church and State

* In the hope that some, who may be unable to see the force of these things, as stated by a Member of an Established Church, may be induced to pay more regard to them when they come from another quarter, I have inserted in the Appendix two Extracts—the one from the work of a most bitter, though talented enemy to Church Establishments, the late Rev. Mr Ballantine: the other from the Theology of Dwight, who certainly cannot, with any plausibility, be suspected of party spirit in reference to this question. See Appendix, Note A.

involved him, as regards the Sabbath. "Perhaps it may be admitted," says he, "that there are few topics from which considerations of greater plausibility may be derived in favour of Civil Establishments of religion than the law of the Sabbath." However, neither Dr Wardlaw nor Mr M'Gavin could make up his mind to abandon the protection of the Sabbath by the State. They thought, indeed, to save their cause in the matter of the alliance between Church and State, by limiting the Magistrate's protection of the Sabbath to *civil purposes for which God has appointed it*. Whether this limitation saves it or not, we shall soon see; but in the mean time, let their language on this subject be carefully observed. Dr Wardlaw's words are these:—"May the law of the Sabbath, then, be legitimately incorporated with the code of any other community, and be enforced by human authority? The answer which I am disposed to return to this question is, that in one respect it cannot, while in another it may and ought.—It is obvious, that the Sabbathical rest is of a twofold description, and embraces two descriptions of ends. In its observances, and in its objects, it is at once of a secular, and of a moral and spiritual character. It is a day of rest and refreshment to man and beast, from the toils of the preceding days,—of man, especially when subject to his fellow-man, and of beast, as placed under the dominion of this lord of the lower creation;—and it is, at the same time, a day to be "kept holy," sacred to the worship of God, and the cultivation of spiritual principles and affections. Now it appears to me, that in the latter of these views, the observance

it cannot be the subject of human legislation ; while in the former it may.—It does not seem enough to say, that it is merely competent to human legislatures, to enact the cessation from labour on the seventh day ;—the law of God, we apprehend, makes it incumbent upon them to do so.—By this institute, there are allotted to men six days of labour, and one of rest, in regular alternation. This day of rest, then, belongs to every man, by the law of God. It is property,—property to which there is a divinely guaranteed title.” In a note the Doctor has these words : “ These views of the political obligation of the Sabbath, which I have long held, I was glad to find in harmony with those of my friend Mr William M’Gavin”—from whose “ Letters to a Covenanter” an Extract is then given to the same purpose.*

In reference, then, to this new, and certainly very peculiar view of the Magistrate’s duty respecting the Sabbath, I would, in the first place, ask, on what grounds a legislature, professing to lay out of view altogether the spiritual ends of the Sabbath, could require the people, in order to their temporal ‘rest and refreshment,’ to cease, for one whole day in every week, from those public amusements, which are regarded as no labour, but the best recreation by men not under the influence of religion, and cessation from which they in fact feel in a high degree irksome. If you urge the command of God to this effect, the answer, of course, is, that His command never contemplated a separation of the spiritual from the temporal ends of the Sabbath ; that

* Wardlaw’s Discourses on the Sabbath, pp. 157, 159, 164, 165.

there is no reason to believe that, for *secular ends merely*, God would have required men to rest in a way which, to the great majority of them, proves exceedingly irksome, and which, but for the restraints of religion, could only afford leisure to the wicked for the practice of iniquity; and, therefore, that if the spiritual ends of the Sabbath be put out of view, there is no evidence of a divine law on the subject at all. It is easy to talk about protecting the Sabbath on grounds merely secular, in a country where the people are known to regard the Sabbath as a spiritual institution; but the separation is absurd and childish in its own nature. It is ridiculous to suppose the legislature requiring the people, with a view to their temporal comfort and recreation alone, to observe a rest which, if spiritual ends be laid out of view, would not only be exceedingly irksome, but would hold out the most inviting opportunities to all manner of ill-disposed persons, to pursue their respective courses of wickedness. The preamble of such a statute could never be made to tally with its enactments. What would the French people think, were their legislature to propose the shutting up of all their theatres, tea gardens, markets, &c. on the Sabbath day, in order that all classes might enjoy *rest and refreshment* during one day of every week? There must be something radically wrong, when men of good sense are forced to seek refuge from their difficulties in refinements so childish.*

* I cannot avoid quoting here, by way of contrast with the petty sort of legislation to which Dr Wardlaw's principle would give rise a few words from the late 'Report of the Committee of the House of Commons on the observance of the Lord's Day.'—"The ex-

But further,—It requires no great penetration to see at, if the State be bound to protect the Sabbath on e ground of a divine mandate, though it be only with ference to man's *temporal* well-being, then the whole ible, in one way or another, comes within the scope of uman legislation, and our opponents must give up their ause. Is the law of the Sabbath the only law in the Bible that bears on the temporal well-being of man ? Is there any law in the Bible that does not bear upon it ? It is a truth so certain and notorious, as to have become a common-place unworthy of being formally laid down, that the temporal well-being of man is inseparable from true religion, and that whatever tends to promote the one, tends directly to promote the other. It plainly follows, therefore, that, if the State be to act on the principles of Dr Wardlaw and Mr

press commandment of the Almighty affords the plain and un- doubted rule for man's obedience in this as in other things.— "The objects to be attained by legislation may be considered to e, first, a solemn and decent outward observance of the Lord's day as that portion of the week which is set apart by divine command for public worship, &c.—Your Committee feel assured that an increase of true religion must also follow, in as much as many persons, thus favoured with an entire day of rest, would be led to employ it for religious purposes ; and that a great accession would accrue to the strength and prosperity of the state itself, arising out of the improved one of morals which a due observance of the Sabbath day invariably produces. And there are, moreover, abundant grounds, both in he Word of God and in the history of past ages, to expect that His blessing and favour would accompany such an endeavour to promote he honour due to His holy name and commandment."

I have also pleasure in inserting in the Appendix a passage om the Eclectic Review for April last, from which it will ap- ear how widely these reviewers now feel obliged to differ from Dr Vardlaw, whether they agreed with him in June, 1830, or not. See pp. Note B.

M'Gavin, it must regard the whole of religion together as lying within its sphere.

But I have still to add here, that, even were we admit the justness of making a separation between the Sabbatical law, and every thing else in the Bible, allowing that the State is bound to interfere with the Sabbath alone, while in all other respects religion to be expunged from the statute-book,—still our opponents, in accepting this admission at our hands, would be yielding their principle of a separation between Church and State. Nothing can save it from self-destruction but the separation of *all religion* whatever from the State, according to the express recommendation of some other gentlemen. For, in the first place I might ask on what ground shall the legislature be bound to protect the *first* day of the week, rather than the seventh, or any other day? There is no divine law for the first day, apart from the peculiar doctrine and laws of the kingdom of Christ; and a claim on the Jews to have their seventh day protected, would seem more worthy the regard of a State, professing to act on the ground of a divine mandate addressed to it by God, the governor of the world, without a view to Christianity. Moreover, a Christian, as I have been repeatedly observed, can perform no duty acceptably to God, unless in connection with the mediation of the Lord Jesus. It matters not, therefore, with how much refinement you attempt to separate between the spiritual and temporal ends of the Sabbath: if the protecting of it by the State be matter of duty towards God, that duty can lawfully be performed only

connection with Christ and his mediation; and so Church and State are really and thoroughly united.

What has hitherto been said under this first head of our subject, might have been greatly strengthened by a consideration of the Old Testament examples and precepts bearing on the subject. I willingly, however, defer the consideration of these to the second head of the argument; first, because it may well seem to the reader a waste of time to elaborate a proof on a matter so simple that, in truth, we ought never to have been called to argue it at all, and the discussion of which has only been rendered necessary by the mode in which our opponents have chosen to carry on this controversy: and, secondly, because the argument drawn from the Old Testament examples and precepts is applicable not merely to the union between Church and State in general, but to the subject of a *national endowment* of the Church, and will, therefore, more naturally fall to be considered under the second head, which respects the particular union subsisting between the State and the Church of Scotland. Let it only be observed that, if the argument drawn from this source establish the duty of the magistrate to endow the Church, *a fortiori* it establishes the general principle of the union between Church and State.

If the line of argument pursued in the preceding pages has been successfully followed out, it is manifest that the grand objection to the union of Church and State, which our opponents draw from the diversity of their nature, falls to the ground. This diversity is cheerfully conceded; and the often quoted text—"My kingdom is not of this world"—is but one

of many declarations to this effect. But we have seen not only that they are not in such sort diverse, as not to admit of being united, but that they cannot possibly be separated, unless Christian rulers can make up their minds to disjoin their whole official acts from the authority of Him whom they call Lord and Master, and so cast all religion together out of the State.

I have now, however, to advance a step higher; and to affirm, not only that the diverse nature of these kingdoms is not incompatible with their union, but that it is just their diversity of nature which renders them capable of union. The Erastians allege against the Presbyterian that there can be no power in a State which is not created by the State; and that the Presbyterian principle of the independence of the Church upon the State, creates the anomaly of an *imperium in imperio*, or two independent authorities which may maintain opposite claims, and exact opposite services, as to place the subjects in a situation in which it will be impossible for them to obey both. Now, this argument could admit of no answer, if the powers were of the same order,—if both the Church and the State claimed a right to dispose of the persons and the properties of their subjects, and both employed physical force to secure compliance with their commands. But since the State is a civil, and the Church a spiritual kingdom, they may unite, and confer upon each other the most important benefits, without the slightest discord.

It is not a little amusing to observe the great pains which our opponents take to prove the spirituality of Christ's kingdom; and with how much confidence

they take it for granted, that, having established this point, (which no sound Presbyterian ever doubted), they have established the incompatibility of a union between the Church and the State. A great part, for example,

Dr Wardlaw's sermon against "Civil Establishments of Christianity" is taken up in proving, that the Church is a spiritual society, distinct, and, in various important particulars, diverse from the State. It is manifest, indeed, that this is the topic on which he mainly depends. Now, the truth is, that, were the Church ~~not~~ a spiritual society,—were it *not* distinct, and, in various important particulars, diverse from the State,—there could not only be no friendly union between them, but the one could not fail to clash with, and look with a malignant eye upon the other. It was to prevent Pilate being led to regard the Church with a hostile eye, through misapprehension of her true nature, that Christ made that illustrious declaration of the spirituality of his kingdom, which has been so often quoted, and grossly misapplied in this controversy,—
 "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews. But now is my kingdom not from hence. Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." In these words, it was evidently our Lord's design to teach, that, as a consequence of the spiritual nature of his kingdom, Cæsar had no ground to be afraid of any in-

interference from that quarter *with the peculiar duties and rights* of earthly monarchs. Now that, instead of avowed enemies to Christianity, many of the rulers of the nations have become its avowed friends, we may safely follow out the application of the words, and say, that the spirituality of the Church is that which, while it secures rulers against all interference on her part *with their peculiar office*, does, in that very security, give room for a most harmonious union between her and the State, to the furtherance of the grand objects contemplated by them respectively. Were the Church and the State of an essentially *opposite* nature, of course they could not unite. Were their powers, rights, and duties *of the same order*, their union were incongruous, and destructive to both. But since they are neither of the *same order*, nor opposite, but *distinct and diverse*, each having its own peculiar sphere and mode of operation, their union is in all respects natural and congruous. As well might it be said, that the diverse nature of body and soul—the one being material, and the other wholly spiritual—is incompatible with any legitimate union between them. Not only do we most pleasantly experience that there is no incompatibility in the matter, but we may safely affirm, that it is just because the soul is not united with another soul, which possibly might think, feel, and will, in opposition to it, but with a body whose functions are not of a spiritual order,—that it is just on this account that they are capable of harmonious union. Analogies are dangerous; and it is not intended to identify the proof of the point in hand with the applicability

of this, or any other similitude. Perhaps, however, it might appear, on further thought, that the case of body and soul is singularly analogous to the union between Church and State: for, whatever the despisers of religion may think,—the body were hardly more incapable of discharging its functions without the soul, than would civil government be of discharging its functions without religion.

“The advantages,” says Dr Hill, “which the Church imparts to the State, arise from the nature and the purpose of that power which exists in every Christian society. This power, addressing itself to the understanding, to the conscience, and the heart, may correct excesses of the passions which human regulations cannot reach, and, by furnishing refined and permanent principles of good conduct, may minister most effectually to the order and happiness of the community. This is the genuine influence of the doctrine of Christ. The power which is founded upon his doctrine ministers its part of this influence, so long as it retains the character of being purely spiritual. It is perverted when it is rendered the instrument of disturbing the public tranquillity; and it goes beyond the purpose of its institution, when its particular requisitions intrench upon that right over the persons and properties of the subjects, which belongs exclusively to the sovereign authority in the State. Such abuses have, indeed, frequently arisen in the Christian Church. But they have always arisen from confounding a spiritual and a civil power.” *

But I have still to advance a step higher; and to

* Hill's Lectures, vol. iii. p. 462. 2d edit.

submit it to the consideration of sober-minded persons, whether there be not something in the very nature of Christianity, in consequence of which it *could* have no security even for *bare protection* from the State,—no, nor any *just claim* to protection, save on the ground of its truth, and the duty of the State to acknowledge it as divine. There is no doubt that your *liberal* religions, which teach that there are many roads to heaven, and that, let men live as they list, they shall meet there at last,—that such religions will experience no difficulty in the matter of public protection; just as the heathen governments were perfectly willing to tolerate as many additional gods as might be offered for their acceptance, provided their worship interfered not with the worship of those already in repute. But, as Christianity no sooner began to make 'progress in the Roman empire than it was persecuted, so I cannot but believe that this persecution arose out of the very genius of Christianity in connection with human depravity. No system is, indeed, more thoroughly in harmony with civil government, viewed simply as such, and its tendencies to promote the good of mankind: nor is there any thing in the Gospel which requires or warrants any direct interference on the part of the Church, with civil governors in the exercise of their peculiar duties. But Christianity is opposed to all sin, in high and low, in civil and in sacred stations: and, unless by being prevented from spreading, it cannot possibly fail to interfere indirectly, and very materially with unchristian *governors* as respects the *manner* of their discharging their peculiar duties.

For example, an able, zealous, and faithful race of men should rise up in France, and protest publicly, manfully, and, to a considerable extent, effectively against the desecration of the Sabbath, by military retheatrical amusements, cabinet council meetings, &c. It is manifest that this would not only be an interference, but a very serious and painful, though indirect interference with the principles and feelings, as well as the rights of the rulers of France, as of the people at large. I do not merely ask, whether preaching like this would have any security of being protected, unchristianity and the Sabbath were expressly legalised, whether, on the principles of our opponents, they would *justly claim* protection from the State? They would say that the Legislature of France is not only not warranted, but not warranted to recognise Christianity as divine. On any other supposition, however, than that of its divinity, and the right which its Ministers derive from God to preach in this manner, on what principle of common sense could the rulers of France be warranted to permit, or even justified in permitting their acts to be reviled, and their characters imaged before the face of their people; more especially considering that many of the employments and amusements protested against, are, upon all principles, save those of Christianity, viewed as a divine service, identified with the peaceable, contented, and happy condition of the French people. It is very probable that the French government might find it on the whole more *expedient* to refrain from interference in cases like this. But on no principle, save the recognition of Christianity as divine, could they be

bound to refrain from it; and I cannot see *th*ing could even *justify* them, but a cor that interference would not have the effect of *ting* down the evil. On supposition, however, the State is bound to recognise Christianity its institutions as coming from God, and the laws of France, like those of Great Britain, acknowledged the Christian ministry as an ordinance and the Sabbath as a day which he had appointed kept holy to himself, then, although very p the government might break its own laws by i private meetings, at least, of a secular kind up Sabbath, yet the ministers of Christ would be no public wrong, but, on the contrary, support very laws of their country, in protesting against and every other breach of that law which the State acknowledged as the law of God, its supreme i nor.

I am quite aware that Christianity is tolerated in countries where it is not acknowledged by the State as divine; and that Christians, in some of these countries, feel as secure of protection in their worship as we do. But I think it may easily be shown, that the protection is not the result of any *legitimate pr* requiring it; that if the rulers of these countries *to act* on those principles of official indifference to the truth of Christianity which they profess, they i would nor could secure protection to its worship and that the real source of the security which Christians in these countries feel, lies in the general valence of Christianity among the members of the community, which *in practice* is found to be in

able from showing it *public favour*; thus comes in to supply the want of a national recognition of its divine authority; and both allows and obliges all the branches of the State to act in many important matters, as if the religion of Christ had been acknowledged by the State as divine.

To put this to the test, let us endeavour to transfer ourselves in imagination to a period and a country different from what we live in; and suppose that, in some district where the Gospel has made little progress, but where very strenuous exertions are made for its propagation, the worship of a Christian assembly is disturbed by petty insults and annoyances: and that, on the case being brought by the Christians before a judicial assembly, constituted upon those principles of official indifference to the truth of Christianity which our opponents maintain, a defence to the following effect is put in:—That the preachers of Christianity had disturbed the harmony of the whole neighbourhood: that they had stood forth day after day, denouncing its inhabitants, in common with mankind at large, as in a state of depravity and alienation from God and his favour; declaring, that, unless men fell in with their way of thinking, which they professed to have learned from God himself, there was no hope of salvation for them; and that, as they valued their everlasting welfare, they must change their maxims and practices, take up their cross,—and so forth: that, in consequence of all this, the heads of the young and the timid had been filled with foolish alarms about sin, and judgment, and eternity—"the father had been divided against the son, and the son against the father;

the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother:" and that the inhabitants offered the annoyance complained of, in hopes it might put an end to this unprovoked aggression.

Well; the Court proceeds to administer justice the principles of our opponents, apart from all consideration of the truth of Christianity. The Judge is bound faithfully to administer the laws; and the laws know nothing of Christianity or its Ministers. In these circumstances, it does seem to me that the assurance of protection, at least continued protection to Christians, to be made good by the strong arm of law, were wholly out of the question. It is obvious that the preaching complained of is either true, founded upon God's authority; or it is a foul calumny on the community,—well fitted to exasperate and, in proportion to its prevalence throughout the country, to bring into contempt the authority of the Rulers, *if they refuse to embrace the doctrine preached*. Whatever, therefore, may be the private opinions and leanings of the Judge, there is no middle course left for him to pursue. He cannot go on the supposition that the preaching is entitled to protection, because founded upon God's command: it is complained of as an offence and a libel upon men whom the law can charge with no crime: and it only remains, therefore, that he inform the Christian Ministers, that they must expect to be followed with an armed force to prevent them in the promulgation of tenets offensive to their fellow-subjects; that if they persist in so preaching to provoke their dislike, they must make up

minds to be annoyed ; and that, in the event of the public peace being disturbed, their only protection must be their imprisonment.

Does it not result from the very nature of Christianity, that *indifference* to it is *hostility* ; *protection*, *favour* ? “ He that is not with me (says Christ) is against me ; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad.”*

When the influential part of a community becomes favourable to Christianity, it naturally comes to be a question—by what method they shall effectually protect their worship against the hostility of infidels, and the worse sort of sectarians. Will the mere law that assures protection to every peaceable subject, be enough to secure protection for the Christian Minister in the un-

* “ Now it was,” (says Milner, speaking of the year 64,) “ that the Romans legally persecuted the church for the first time. And those who know the virulence of man’s natural enmity, will rather wonder that it commenced not earlier, than that it raged at length with such dreadful fury. Some persons were apprehended who confessed themselves Christians, and by their evidence, says Tacitus, a great multitude afterwards were discovered and seized:—and they were condemned, not so much for the burning of Rome, as for being the enemies of mankind.” A very remarkable accusation ! It may be explained as follows :—True Christians, though the genuine friends of all their fellow-creatures, cannot allow men, who are not true Christians, to be in the favour of God. Their very earnestness in calling on their neighbours to repent and believe the Gospel, proves to those neighbours in what a dangerous state they are then apprehended to be. All who are not moved by the admonitions of Christian charity to flee from the wrath to come, will naturally be disgusted ; and thus the purest benevolence will be construed into the most merciless bigotry. Thus Christians incurred the general hatred, to which the conduct neither of Jews nor heretics rendered them obnoxious. And the same cause produces similar effects to this day.—Vol. I. chap. xv.

compromising discharge of his duties? No; for, on any other supposition than that of the truth of Christianity, the faithful discharge of these duties involves an unfair and public attack on the character and proceedings of the community. If, then, protection is to be secured to him, it must be on one of two principles: either, first, that the laws remaining as they are, it be left to the administrators of them to bring in their private leanings in favour of Christianity, to supply the want of a legal declaration of its truth and right to protection—(the absurdity of which, who sees not?)—or secondly, that the influential part of the community having embraced Christianity as a religion from God,—and a religion, therefore, which is entitled to protection, however offensive its tenets may prove to those who do not choose to embrace them,—do proceed forthwith to embody this their faith among the laws of the community, and thus to furnish the administrators of the laws with a legitimate ground, on which to protect against all interference the worship of the Christian Church, and the faithful and uncompromising discharge of ministerial duty.

The Dissenters of this country, loud in their protestations against all favour shown by the State towards Christianity, are little aware how much they owe to that very favour of which they imagine themselves independent. They have long enjoyed full liberty to exercise their worship, free from molestation of every kind. No one has sought to interrupt them: they have feared no interruption. At length they ignorantly and ungratefully throw contempt upon the means to which, under God, they have been in a great measure indebted

these invaluable privileges. Had they lived in the
 es of their forefathers, they would have learned to
 lge in a very different manner: and experience
 ould then, perhaps, have taught them, that it is just
 impossible for a State to be indifferent to Christian-
 7, without hindering its progress, as for an indivi-
 dual to be neither with Christ nor against him.

As for the objection to the union of Church and
 ate, drawn from its *abuse*, it is enough for the pre-
 nt, and viewing it as urged against all union be-
 tween them, to reply—that it is worthless in the face
 f a proof that the union of Church and State in some
 rape, is not only not unlawful, but matter of indis-
 ensable obligation. What weight is due to this ob-
 ection, when urged against a *national endowment* of
 he Church, shall be inquired by and by.

It is high time that we proceed to consider the se-
 cond of the two grounds on which the enemies of our
 Church Establishment may take their stand,—namely,
 that supposing all union between Church and State
 were not unjustifiable, the union which subsists in the
 case of the Church of Scotland is so. This position
 involves the consideration of various matters demand-
 ing a somewhat more lengthened discussion than those
 which have, as yet, come under review.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE POSITION,—THAT, SUPPOSING ALL UNION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE WERE NOT UNJUSTIFIABLE, THE UNION WHICH SUBSISTS IN THE CASE OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IS SO.

THE Union which subsists between the Church of Scotland and the State, includes a variety of particulars besides her National Endowment. For the sake however, of brevity and precision, I propose to confine the argument chiefly to this, which is certainly the most invidious effect of the union, and the one against which the efforts of Dissenters are specially levelled. They will themselves allow, that, if repelled at this point, they ought to lay down their weapons.

There are three principal grounds upon which our opponents may here take their stand.

First, That a national endowment of the Church is *opposed to Scripture*.

Secondly, That, supposing it were not unscriptural it is *unnecessary* and *inexpedient*.

Thirdly, That it is unjust to endow the Church of Scotland *exclusively*; and still more to make all other bodies of Christians contribute to her support.

Each of these grounds I propose to take up in distinct section.

SECTION I.

On the Allegation, That the Endowment of the Church by the State is opposed to Scripture : showing that, on the contrary, the Word of God requires our Civil Rulers to endow the Church.

I CANNOT begin the consideration of this subject better, than by quoting the opening paragraph of a document lately put forth by the Edinburgh Voluntary Church Association, under the title of "Examination of the Equity and Expediency of Ecclesiastical Establishments." It forms the first of a series of papers which they have promised to the public in one of their rules,—that "the object of the Society shall be to disseminate, by publications and otherwise, the principles on which it is founded, and to expose and obtain redress of grievances under which Dissenters may labour." I do sincerely pity the men who could bring themselves to open their *pleadings* in the following manner: "Some of the most eminent churchmen have allowed that the connexion of Church and State cannot plead the authority of revelation. It might be fairly questioned, whether Christ would have left such an important deficiency to be supplied by the wisdom of men; and whether such writers as Paley, Warburton, and Hill, would have admitted that he has done so, unless truth had compelled them to make the concession. But passing over these questions for the present, and without attempting to prove, as we might, that establishments, besides wanting the sanction, violate the clear prohibitions of God's word, we shall merely remark, on the

above admission, that, when Scripture is denied us, we have a right to expect the stronger arguments from reason."

So, then, it seems that Scripture has been "denied to these gentlemen by the friends of Ecclesiastical Establishments! Warburton, Paley, and Hill having admitted—(as is alleged, at least, though in direct contradiction to fact as respects one of them, and him the only one of the three to whose judgment any weight is due in a question about the *doctrines* of the Bible see note on p. 45,)—that the connection of Church and State cannot plead the authority of revelation, *therefore* Scripture in defence of this connection has been denied! So the Christian public are taught by the gentlemen to believe. It is impossible for any plain reader to understand them otherwise, than as pledging their veracity in this paragraph, that no writer of respectability at least,—none whose opinion is much worth adverting to, has pleaded Scripture authority for the connection. Were, then, the clergymen of the United Secession, whose names appear in the office-bearers in this society, ignorant of a Work published some twenty years ago by Dr M'Crie, in name of his Presbytery, entitled "Statement of the Difference between the Profession of the Reformed Church of Scotland, as adopted by Seceders, and the Profession contained in the New Testament, and other Acts as adopted by the General Associate Synod, particularly on the power of Civil Magistrates respecting Religion?" Perhaps the progress of new light has brought them to estimate the authority of writers like Warburton and Paley higher than that of t

grapher of Knox. Did these gentlemen never
 once to lay their hands on a book which is still
 own among persons curious in antiquities, by the
 name of "Gib's Display," or on Willison of Dun-
 's "Defence of National Churches?" Did they
 ever hear of John Owen's views on this matter,
 how in his day he "prayed the good Lord to keep
 hearts" of the Parliament of England from the
 y doctrines which are now proclaimed with as
 ch arrogant self-confidence, as if none but bigoted
 richmen had ever thought of disputing them? Are
 their minds so engrossed with the improvements of
 modern times, that their memories have become a
 perfect blank as to all that noble host of writers in
 theology that flourished during the seventeenth cen-
 tury—the Augustan age of Christian theology? Have
 they forgot, that, during that age, the opinions they
 assert with so much self-complacency, as very
 common in religion, were confined to Quakers, and a
 few other Sectarians; and that the Scriptural power
 and duty of the Magistrate *circa sacra*, was one of the
 common places in all the most esteemed systems of
 theology? Whether they were ignorant of all this or
 not, the fact is, that in a document published by them
 with all formality, the opinion of Warburton, Paley,
 and Hill* is held forth to the public as a fair cri-

* I should like very much to be informed in what part of Dr
 Hill's Works the Association found this admission,—that the con-
 nection of Church and State cannot plead the authority of revela-
 tion. In his Lectures, the question of Church Establishments is not
 touched. And in the Theological Institutes, I not only can find no
 mention of the kind, but in Part II. Sect. 1, "On the Connection
 Church and State," there occurs the following passage, which it is

terion of the value of the argument from Scripture, and the reader is given to understand, that safely regard the friends of Establishments a

to be hoped for their own sake, that the gentlemen of the nation will not be able to peruse without the deepest feelings and self-condemnation. After stating the connection between the Church and the State, first among the Heathen and then among the Christians, he adds, "For some ages, indeed, the rulers of States led to the bigotry of those who, from attachment to the established religions, were the avowed enemies of the new (the Christian). But the same prophets who announced its appearance, had foretold that it was not always to continue an object of persecution. Jewish princes are praised in the Old Testament for their fidelity to the law and of the worship of God, so David, looking for the reign of his illustrious descendant, says of the Messiah, "Of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the kings of the East and Seba shall offer gifts; yea, all kings shall fall down before him:" Ps. lxxii, 10, 11. And the evangelical prophet introduces the Lord God thus speaking to the Church when she is to gather from the heathen, "Behold, I will lift up my standard in the midst of the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people; and shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers. They shall bow down to thee with their faces toward the earth." Ps. lxxviii, 22, 23. When Constantine, therefore, adopted the Christian religion as the national religion, and when his successors in the Roman empire, and in the different kingdoms into which the empire was divided, strengthened by various regulations the connection which he had established between the Christian Church and the State, they were the instruments of fulfilling one part of the ancient prophecy respecting the propagation of Christianity, by affording to the Church of Christ a protection and support similar to that which Moses enjoyed under every king who walked in the steps of his father David.

"A connection between the Church and the State, no longer supported by these *authorities* and recommendations, has been disapproved," &c. Again he says a little farther on,—“we rely with entire security upon the promise of him who said, ‘the gates of hell shall not prevail against his church.’ We thankfully acknowledge his wisdom in employing, as an instrument of fulfilling his promise, *this salutary appointment*, the

nied to their opponents any argument from that quarter which is worthy of notice. Persons who take the trouble to look beneath the surface of things will be very apt to conclude from an opening like this, that however anxious these gentlemen may be to "disseminate their principles," they have no real intention—the leaders among them at least—of bringing the subject of Church Establishments into the field of fair and open discussion. That Scripture has been denied them is not the fact. Whether sufficient Scripture authority can be pleaded for a national endowment of the Church is of course another matter,—which I now proceed to consider.

I would begin the discussion of this question, by laying down *three* propositions:—

First. It is our duty to use all lawful means to have a Gospel Ministry planted, and suitably maintained, in every part of the country. This is a plain dictate of Scripture, and needs no illustration.

Secondly. This object cannot be attained, without duty, in return for the support which it derives from the pure principles of religion inculcated by the Gospel, shall concur with Christian moral in repelling every outrage. Ecclesiastical power, feeble and unarmed when opposed to the authority of men, is aided by the authority of human government. The blasphemy and open impiety which shock the feelings of good men, which corrupt the young, and unsettle the minds of the multitude, are restrained by those punishments which the civil magistrate can inflict. The day upon which Christians have, from the beginning, assembled for public worship, is guarded by law from profanation; worshippers are secured against any rude interruption; the ministers of religion are protected in the celebration of the ordinances of the Gospel; and the regular ministrations of an order of men recognised by the civil constitution, furnish a continual exhibition of the doctrines and duties of true religion," &c.

large supplies of money for building churches, and providing such a livelihood for the ministers of the gospel, as may enable them to devote themselves to the duties of their sacred calling.—In all the writers on the other side, we find a great deal of language to the following effect:—"The kingdom of Christ was not to prosper 'by might nor by power, but by the Spirit of the living God;' that God who 'chose the weak things of the world to confound the things that were mighty.' The word of God—the sword of the Spirit—was the only weapon tolerated in the spiritual wars of the King of Zion. This was the sword which he himself 'girded upon his thigh,' when, 'in meekness, and truth, and righteousness,' he rode forth to 'subdue the people under him;' and no other was ever used with his authority and approbation. His conquests are conquests of hearts; and the instruments of effecting them, spiritual illumination and persuasion."* Now all this is very true: but Dr Wardlaw and his friends are quite aware that, nevertheless, we are not to look for the planting and maintaining of a Gospel Ministry, and so not to look for the diffusion of the Gospel, without *money*,—whether it be a carnal weapon or not; and that if, in addition to providing the means of religious instruction for our own country, be taken into view our share in the duty of sending the Gospel to, and maintaining it among the many myriads of the heather inhabitants of the globe, there will appear to be need

* Sermon on Civil Establishments of Christianity, by Ralph Wardlaw, D.D., p. 32.

only of money, but money in very large quantities, such as have never yet been raised in any country, with or without the aid of an Establishment. Passing now, for a moment, the question, whether it lie at all *within the sphere* of the Legislature to provide for maintaining a Gospel Ministry—beserve,

Thirdly. That the Legislature has *the power* at present, of raising the needful supplies of money for this purpose, to an extent which no individual, and no other body of men, civil or ecclesiastical, can pretend to reach.—As the first of these three propositions is a plain dictate of Scripture, so the second and third are no less obvious dictates of common sense and experience.

I now proceed to affirm,—that *the Word of God requires the Legislature to make use of those peculiar facilities which it possesses, for the purpose in question.* The proof to be adduced in support of this affirmation, shall be comprised under several heads:—and,

FIRST. It will not be disputed by any one who acknowledges the authority of Scripture, that civil rulers are, in their official capacity, the servants of God,—that they are appointed by Him to fulfil certain important duties, in his behalf, and in order to the accomplishment of his designs. No less than three verses within the compass of as many verses in the fifteenth chapter of Romans, the civil ruler is termed the “minister of God.” In consequence of this position in which rulers stand to God, nothing can be more certain than their obligation to acknowledge Him in connexion with their whole official acts.

Our opponents have not yet come the length of formally denying the duty of Civil Rulers to offer up prayers and thanksgivings in the senate: and of course it matters nothing that, in a country where the Christian church is planted, such acts of worship are offered up more immediately by the Ministers of religion; since they act in the affair at the request and in the name of the Legislature. The duty, in fact, is that of the state or nation, acknowledging God its Author, Governor, and Benefactor, through the medium of its representatives and rulers. Every one, however, sees the absurdity and impiety of proposing to offer up such acts of worship, without avowing in them a concern, not only for the temporal good of the country, in connection with God's blessing, but for the promotion of His glory in general, and in particular for the prosperity of that Church of his Son Christ Jesus, with whose welfare God regards his own interests and honour as in a manner identified; and for whose good not only empires, but all creation together has been subordinated to Him who is the Church's Head and Lord.*

Well; can it be for a moment imagined that it lies, indeed, within the sphere of Civil Rulers professing Christianity, and is their duty *as such*, to offer up acknowledgments to God *in words*, and in words to profess their concern for the promotion of his glory and the prosperity of his church; but that it does not lie within their sphere, and is not their duty, to afford, in name of the country, any *substan*

* Ephes. ii. 22, 23.

tial proof of the reality and the depth of this concern? The same God who is the Author, Governor and Benefactor of the State, has erected a Church, which, though not of the world, is in the world. In order to its prosperity, certain means must be used which may or may not be within the reach of Christians as such, and which, at all events, the State has the power of providing, to an extent which no individual, and no body of men, civil or ecclesiastical, can reach. Surely, in these circumstances, it were sheer hypocrisy for the State,—while pursuing with all eagerness and activity its temporal prosperity,—to rest content with declaring *in words* its concern for God's honour, the universal hallowing of His name, and the manifestation of His perfections; withholding, all the while, that substantial token of sincerity,—*the employing of the means which are peculiarly at its command for the accomplishment of these ends.*

True it is that the first duty of every man, and of every body of men, is to do the peculiar work of their own station, taking care, at the same time, to avoid all such interference with others as would prevent them from discharging theirs. The servant must not neglect the peculiar purposes for which he was appointed, under pretence of doing, or assisting his neighbour to do other things of greater importance: and he must further beware of justling out a fellow-servant under any pretence, from the sphere allotted to him. If, therefore, in giving the substantial token in question, civil rulers were constrained to neglect the temporal welfare of their subjects, or in any way to compromise the duties of their civil station; or, if they could not

give it without intruding—Saul and Uzziah-like—into the spiritual functions assigned exclusively to the office-bearers of the Church,—then it were unlawful to give it, and the Church ought to be left to her own resources. So far, however, from compromising the peculiar duties and ends of their civil office by making the provision in question, we shall by and by see that it is a provision so essentially conducive to these very duties and ends, that the Word of God and the light of reason bind Civil Rulers to make it, were it for no other purpose than to *promote them*. It is enough, however, for the present argument, that the provision contended for does *not hinder* the full discharge of the more peculiar duties of the State towards its subjects. And then,—as to the other matter of justling the office-bearers of the Church out of their peculiar sphere,—this serious mistake may, doubtless, be committed, by overlooking the essential distinctness of Church and State, and constituting the provision on such a footing, as either to admit civil rulers to assume the discharge of duties which belong exclusively to ecclesiastical office-bearers, or to put legal restraints on the Church in the performance of her spiritual functions. By sound Presbyterians, however, every thing of this kind has been most strenuously contended against. They have laid down their lives in opposing all interference on the part of civil rulers with that which does not lie within their sphere; and it is equally absurd and unfair to charge upon that provision which we say the State ought to make for the Church, as her *friend and ally*, the evil of the State losing sight of the distinctness and independence of

the Church, and, instead of her friend and ally, attempting to become her governor.

SECONDLY. I proceed to a second head of argument in support of the affirmation,—that the Word of God requires the Legislature to make use of those peculiar facilities which it possesses, for providing the means of religious instruction. The office of Magistracy being of divine appointment, it is evident that God must require those who occupy it, to use all lawful means in order to *discharge its duties with the utmost possible efficiency*. Every man who undertakes a lawful office, is of course bound by the law of God to fulfil its duties to the best of his ability. Now, all parties are agreed, that the Magistrate's office has *at least* for its object the temporal welfare of the community: and all parties, therefore, must agree, that Civil Rulers are bound by the law of God to promote the temporal welfare of society, by every lawful means within their power. It is no less certain, however, that the diffusion of the principles of religion through a community is the best, and the only efficient means of upholding and strengthening those moral principles on which permanent obedience to human laws, and the peace of civil society depend. It were easy to occupy many pages in setting forth the advantages which accrue to States, from the fear of God extensively prevalent among the people. I would simply observe, that, besides the mighty energy with which a belief in the great articles of religion operates, above all other motives, in drawing men to respect the laws of temperance, justice, and humanity,—in softening and refining the human character,—and in exalting the intellectual

and moral, to their proper ascendancy over the mere animal part of our nature,—that, besides this, no man who believes in God as the Moral Governor of empires can possibly doubt, that, however ungodly nations may seem for a time to prosper, the Most High will ere long, by a secret and irresistible power, divide their counsels, frustrate their most refined projects, and make their destruction a monument of his supreme regard to his own authority, and righteous jealousy for his honour and worship. “There is a great analogy,” says Dr South, “between the body natural and politic; in which the ecclesiastical or spiritual part justly supplies the part of the soul, and the violent separation of this from the other, does as certainly infer death and dissolution, as the disjunction of the body and the soul in the natural; for when this once departs, it leaves the body of the commonwealth a carcass noisome, and exposed to be devoured by birds of prey. The ministry will be one day found, according to Christ’s word, *the salt of the earth*, the only thing that keeps societies of men from stench and corruption.—The Magistracy cannot so much protect the Ministry, but the Ministers can do more in serving the Magistrate.”

But if it is a thing thus beyond all doubt, that, in proportion as religion is diffused through a community, the good of a country, in the narrower, as well as the more extensive sense, is promoted, and the ends of the Magistrate’s office most effectually accomplished,—how ridiculous to maintain that it does not lie within the Magistrate’s sphere, or that it is not his duty, to use means for promoting among his

jects religion and the fear of God! How absurd to hold that the principal means of rendering the Magistrate's office effectual, lies wholly beyond the Magistrate's control! It is not denied that he may and ought to give encouragement to the Arts and Sciences, and to provide suitable means for the improvement of the human mind generally, in things intellectual and moral. And shall it be said, that he is not bound and not entitled to employ those facilities which are peculiarly at his command for promoting *religion*,—lying, as it does, so near the foundation of every thing that is worthy to be termed improvement; without which human nature is in many respects debased beneath the very brute natures, and mere knowledge and intellect, instead of constituting Wisdom, only confer a greater power of doing mischief?*

* I might confirm these things by extracts from all the best writers on jurisprudence, both in ancient and modern times. I shall content myself with a few words from Puffendorf:—"For as all voluntary actions have their beginning from, and depend upon the will, but the will to do or not to do, depends on the opinion which every man forms of the good or evil, reward or punishment, that will result from doing or omitting, and thus the actions of all men are regulated by their opinions; it will be necessary to employ external means, in order that these opinions and judgments may, as far as possible, agree, or, at least, that their discrepancy may not disturb the State. Hence, it is expedient, that the State should, as it were, resound with those doctrines which accord with the end and interest of states; and, farther, that the minds of the citizens should be imbued with these from their very youth: since most men are wont to judge of things as they have been accustomed to do, or as they see others commonly judging; while very few are able, by the clearness of their own mind, to discern what is solid in human affairs.——"

In the volume of Mr Marshall, entitled, " Ecclesiastical Establishments further considered," there is a long declamatory paragraph, wherein he attempts to get rid of the Magistrate's duty in this matter, as had been maintained by Dr Burns of Paisley, on the ground just noticed, of its tendency to promote the temporal welfare of the people. The passage is very diffuse; but as it may serve to make some readers a little acquainted with the character of this gentleman's productions, and will also afford an opportunity of advertng to some distinctions of importance, not unfrequently overlooked, I shall take leave to quote the greater part of it.—" The amount of all this briefly expressed, is that the end of civil government being the good of society, whatever tends to the good of society must be the subject of legislation. I appeal to Dr Burns and his friends, if this be not a fair representation of the argument? If every thing that is a means of human improvement—every thing that befriends industry, or encourages diligence in business

But the attainment of this end will be very much forwarded in Christian States by the Christian religion itself, and that part and freed from human devices, inculcated both by the teaching and example of pious and judicious ministers; because, in addition to the doctrines which relate to eternal salvation, it contains the most perfect moral precepts, by which, above every thing else, men are disposed readily to submit themselves to a civil life, and which same precepts cannot be so well sanctioned by civil laws. Public schools will also conduce very much to this end, if in them are taught not empty trifles, and the fancies of idle men,—the remains of the kingdom of darkness,—but solid learning and sciences, whose use extend itself through human and civil life."—*Puffendorf, De Jure Nat. Gent. L. VII. ch. iv. § 8.*—and ix. § 4.—See also his *Dissert. Academ. de Concordia veræ Polit. cum Relig. Christ.*

promotes good neighbourhood, or renders the intercourse of life subservient to the interests of men, every thing of this sort is to be made the subject of isolation, or, in other words, is to be enforced by active institutions and coercive laws, adieu to every effort the world affords! Society in that case, instead of a blessing, would be a curse, &c. Is it not for the good of society that husbands should love their wives, and that wives should reverence their husbands; that children should honour their parents, and that parents, without provoking their children to anger, should bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? Is it not for the good of society that men should be grateful, that they should feel their obligations to their benefactors; is it not for the good of society that men should be compassionate?—&c. Is it not for the good of society also that men should be industrious and economical; that they should not squander their earnings with a thoughtless prod, nor indulge in that slothfulness, which clothes a man with rags?—&c. Are not these and similar virtues for the good of society? Is it not essential to society that they be cultivated? Must not society be of its object if they be not cultivated to a very considerable extent, yet what can government do to promote such virtues? Let government make the attempt, and it will quickly find that it cannot move a step; or rather, that every step it moves, is a step in the wrong way, tending directly to thwart the object which it aims. It might indeed erect an establishment for such virtues—it might institute lectureships, or it might lay a tax on the community to endow the

lecturers—it might even make attendance on the lectures imperative;—but when it had done all, what would be the result? Would any one of the virtues above-named be promoted? or any other virtue? On the contrary, would not men be irritated, and justly irritated? Would they not feel that government was stepping beyond its province? that it was interfering with their private affairs; that it was imposing on them a yoke which it had no right to impose, was exercising a most insufferable and tyrannical usurpation, without producing one particle of good.”

This long quotation may afford the reader a notion of the sort of froth which abounds so much in the productions of this Gentleman, and through the aid of which he swells out his thoughts to so large a bulk. As for any thing like argument in the passage,—it admits of a very simple answer. Were the British government to send a regiment of armed men to some district of the country, enjoining them forthwith to charge the lieges, under pain of imprisonment and confiscation of goods, to love each other, and to be compassionate, and grateful, and industrious, and cleanly,—nobody requires Mr Marshall to inform him; that all this would merit even more than the indignation which he seems to have felt, while penning the above passage. But if, instead of all such ridiculous proceedings, the British government, taking into its consideration the low state of public morals, and considering that, without some improvement in this particular, the laws of the country must rapidly fall into contempt, should resolve to establish national schools, in which religious and moral

struction should be conveyed to the rising generation, —does any body imagine that the various virtues in Mr Marshall's enumeration would *not* be thus promoted? Would any one imagine, "that government was stepping beyond its province—that it was interfering with their private affairs—that it was imposing on them a yoke," &c. &c.? Or suppose further, that government, taking the same things into consideration, along with the efficiency of certain Dissenting Clergymen as public instructors, should resolve to extend to them a share in the *regium donum*. I ask not at present whether this would be an advisable step; but I know that Mr Marshall, at least, would indignantly reject the offer, demanding, "Would any of the virtues above named be promoted, or any other virtue? On the contrary, would not men be irritated; and justly irritated? Would they not feel that government was stepping beyond its province," &c. Mr Marshall seems not to be aware that every lectureship in a University nationally endowed, and more especially the Divinity and Moral Philosophy Chairs, are examples of that very attempt to promote the social virtues by government interference, which he esteems an "insufferable and tyrannical usurpation," incapable of "producing one particle of good."

Before closing the paragraph, Mr M. proceeds to descant upon the distinction which moralists have drawn between *perfect* and *imperfect* obligations. If the reader will excuse a few lines more, he shall not for some time be troubled with another specimen. "The truth is, as every man of sound understanding, not to say of liberal education, knows

that the virtues we have mentioned, and all other virtues most essential to social happiness of that class which moralists call of *imperfect obligation*, that is, virtues which lie beyond the reach of human control, and which all the governments of the world cannot enforce. And is it not exactly so with religion? Is religion but the exercise of love—love to the God our Saviour, and to our fellow men for his sake? Is that love a virtue which, in the technical language, would be called of *perfect obligation*? Does it come under the control of human authority? May the exercise of it be *compelled* by any power under the heavens? Let us hear no more then of the obligation to legislate about religion, because religion is a means to human improvement. If such a principle were allowed out, legislation would not only cover itself in ridicule by attempting what it could not accomplish, but by intermeddling with the most sacred of private concerns would become a nuisance not to be endured?"

It is a delicate matter to be obliged to refer Mr Marshall back to Paley, that he may learn again the distinction between perfect and imperfect obligations: but there is no help for it. On looking then, to Book II. chap. 10, of his *Philosophy* will find the following words:—"III. Rights are perfect or imperfect. Perfect rights may be asserted by force, or, what in civil society comes in the place of private force, by course of law.—Imperfect rights cannot." Mr Marshall, however, appears to understand by virtues of imperfect obligation, "virtues which

beyond the reach of human control" in any way whatever. If this be not his understanding of the matter,—if, by imperfect obligations, he meant what he ought to have meant, those only which cannot be enforced by direct compulsion,—what bearing had this learned distinction of virtues upon the point in hand? Is any body proposing to compel men to be either compassionate or religious by bonds and imprisonment? If, by imperfect obligations, Mr M. understood simply those which cannot be made good by legal force, what did he mean by putting the question, "May the exercise of religion be compelled by any power under the heavens?" The friends of Establishments do not seek to "compel it." They only seek, as in the case of National schools and University chairs, to provide those *moral* means whereby, not religion only, but all the virtues together may be and every day are, legitimately, because morally, controlled. In truth, according to Mr Marshall's view of an imperfect obligation,—that is, an obligation beyond the reach of human control,—there are no imperfect obligations at all; for assuredly there are no duties which are not more or less controllable, provided that, in each case, the means of control employed be suitable to its nature. If it is a duty of the perfect class,—as, for example, that of paying a tax imposed by the Legislature, then it is controllable by sending a constable, in case of disobedience, to seize the property or person. If it is a duty of the imperfect class,—as, for example, the obligation to be kind, humane and religious, then it is controllable, more or less according to circumstances, by addressing to the mind such moral argu-

ments as are fitted to persuade. It is, of course, a matter of perfect indifference, as to this point, whether the person who employs the persuasives be a professor in a University, a parish-schoolmaster, or a clergyman ; or whether the funds that maintain him in his office be exigible by legal measures or not. The only force which is used to compel the *imperfect* obligation is moral, and so perfectly legitimate. That much for Mr Marshall.

The subject of the Magistrate's obligation to endow the Church with a view to the temporal good of his people, affords an illustration which I cannot help noticing, of the impossibility of *separating* the Church from the State, without setting their respective claims in hostility to each other. There are very few, it is presumed, who will hesitate to admit thus much,—that, but for offers made in some shape by the Christian Church, to provide for the religious instruction of the people, it would be the duty of the Magistrate to make provision, the best way he could, for their instruction in the principles of religion : and it is just as clear that, in consistency with duty to his subjects, he could not renounce concern in this matter, unless in the way of *devolving* it upon the Church voluntarily and avowedly, from a conviction that her offers might be fully depended upon. Moreover, the same duty of his office which forbids him to renounce concern in the matter, unless in the way of devolving it on those who can manage it better, must obviously require him to see that the offer be made good,—which just amounts to a virtual devolving of the matter from day to day. Is it not evident, however, that such a voluntary, avowed

and continued devolution by the State to the Church is utterly incompatible with the idea of their *separation*? It is in fact just that friendly alliance for which we contend, with the addition only of this most singular anomaly, that, while the State commits a certain work into the hands of the Church, it not only does not furnish the Church with the means within its reach for doing its own work, but, on the principles of our opponents, could not lawfully do so. A strange kind of alliance to be sure! and yet it is a perfectly real alliance, although made ridiculous by an anomaly. Now the only way that I can perceive for our opponents to get rid of the alliance that would thus be constituted, is to push their principles a little further still, and to deny to the Magistrate all right *to take any thing whatever to do with the religious instruction of his people*, however much religion may conduce to the efficiency of his office; and so, of course, to strip him of all right to make any such devolution as has been referred to. This, however, would be carrying the joke a little too far. Supposing the Church openly to assert any doctrine like this, it is manifest that she sets up claims opposed to and inconsistent with the indefeasible claims of the State; and thus, that the hated alliance is only exchanged for collision and hostility. Let our opponents choose which ever side of this dilemma they like best, either a real alliance of Church and State (whether termed such or not), only with the addition of an absurd anomaly—or an entire separation of Church and State, with the addition of collision between them. We, on the other hand, rejecting any principle that would in-

volve hostility between two servants of God, in respect of the duties which He has committed to their care respectively, do cheerfully embrace the principle of a friendly alliance between them, *without* the anomaly referred to. We hold, that wherever the Christian revelation has been given, it is the duty of the Magistrate not to keep the administering of religious instruction in his own hands, or those of servants appointed by him in separation from the Church, but to acknowledge the ministers of Christ as alone competent to administer it in a way acceptable to God; to testify allegiance to Christ, and regard for the interests of the people, *by voluntarily giving over* the matter into the hands of the Church; and then, having by this act first declared the Church his ally, to follow the declaration up by giving a substantial proof, that it was not from indifference about religion that he devolved the matter, but only from a conviction, that, in this way, the object could be most effectually and legitimately attained.

THIRDLY. I proceed to a third head of argument for the duty of Civil Rulers to provide the means of religious instruction. In the last argument, nothing more was taken for granted than is allowed on all hands, that the Magistrate's office has *at least* for its object the protection of the persons and properties of men, or the good of society, in the lowest sense of the phrase: and we have seen that, were this the sole object of Civil Government, it would still be the duty of Rulers to use means for promoting the fear of God among the people. I affirm, however, that the object of Civil Government is by no means to be thus

mitted, but that its proper object is the *good of society*, in the most extensive sense of the phrase, including peace, justice, humanity, religion,—every thing that forms an element in the present happiness of man. This may be shown, both from reason and the word of God: and

1st. from Reason. While society is maintained among irrational creatures by the mere force of instinct,—right opinion and right feeling are the foundation of all regular society among men; and society is more or less perfect according as the intellectual and moral principles are drawn forth and improved. It thus comes to pass, that even the lowest good of human society is inseparably linked with principles of action which belong to its highest felicity. The good order, for example, of men, includes moral qualities that run up into, and cannot possibly be separated from the principles of religion. Where then, I ask, are we to draw the line between those principles of action which rulers are to cherish and promote for their intrinsic excellence, and those which they are to promote merely with a view to some ulterior end? It is impossible to draw a line of separation between a sense of duty to God the Supreme Ruler on the one hand, and peace and good order among men on the other. If the object of the civil ruler is not the promotion of social happiness in general, to whatever extent it may be in his power to promote it, how much of this happiness and of the principles that go to form it shall be thrown out of his sphere, and how much retained within it?

The same conclusion may be established thus:—

Civil society, wherein the persons and proper individuals are subordinated to the governing for the good of the community, affords facilities for evolving the various elements of good existing in the people, which cannot be enjoyed by individuals or by any society which has not the control of persons and properties. So far as regards the promotion of peace, this is quite evident, and is universally allowed. The same thing, however, is applicable to morality and religion, for the promotion of which the magistrate has the power of establishing such a apparatus of moral means, as neither the Church nor any individuals in or out of the Church, can contrive. But the law of nature requires us to draw forth from our condition the greatest possible measure of good in every kind. The same law of nature, therefore, must require us to *unite in society for this purpose nothing less than this*. Hence it follows, that the end and proper end of civil society, is the good of the community in the most extensive sense of the phrase.

Before leaving the proof from reason, I crave the attention of the reader to a few extracts from the work of the celebrated Vattel on the Law of Nations, a work which ranks in authority with that of Grotius and Puffendorf, in the department of law, and to which some may not be the less disposed to pay respect on account of the fact, that Vattel rests his principles not on Divine Revelation but exclusively on what he conceives to be the dictates of the Law of Nature.*

* In the Appendix, I shall give extracts from this work at somewhat greater length, as it is not in every one's hands.

"Nations or states are bodies politic, societies of men united together, for the purpose of promoting their mutual safety and advantage, by the joint efforts of their combined strength.

"Such a society has her affairs and interests; she deliberates and takes resolutions in common; thus becoming a *moral person*, who possesses an understanding and a will peculiar to herself, and is susceptible of obligations and rights.—

"Man is so formed by nature, that he cannot supply all his own wants, but necessarily stands in need of the intercourse and assistance of his fellow-creatures, whether for his immediate preservation, or for the sake of perfecting his nature, and enjoying such a life as is suitable to a rational being.—Hence is deduced the establishment of natural society among men.

"As men are subject to the laws of nature,—and as their union in civil society cannot have exempted them from the obligation to observe those laws, since by that union they do not cease to be men,—the entire nation, whose common will is but the result of the united wills of the citizens, remains subject to the laws of nature, and is bound to respect them in all her proceedings.—

"The *perfection* of a nation is found in what renders it capable of obtaining the end of civil society;—

"The *end* or object of civil society is to procure for the citizens whatever they stand in need of, for the necessities, the conveniences, the accommodation of life, and, in general, *whatever constitutes happiness*,—

and many of its general principles are of much value. See Appendix, Note C.

with the peaceful possession of property, a man obtaining justice with security, and, finally, a defence against all external violence."

In conformity with this definition of the civil society, Vattel proceeds to treat of the ' principal Objects of a good Government,' under three heads. The first is that of *providing for the needs of the Nation*, under which he includes the cultivation of the soil, commerce, &c.; the second is *procuring the true happiness of the Nation*; the third that of *defence against external attacks*. From the chapters devoted to the second head I make the following extracts:—

"What we have said, in the five preceding chapters, relates to the care of providing for the needs of the people, and procuring plenty in the state is a point of necessity; but it is not sufficient for the happiness of a nation. Experience shows that people may be unhappy in the midst of all enjoyments, and in the possession of the greatest riches. Whatever may enable mankind to obtain true and solid felicity, is a second object that demands the most serious attention of the government.—

"To succeed in this, it is necessary to instruct the people to seek felicity where it is to be found, is, in their own perfection,—and to teach them the means of obtaining it. The sovereign cannot take too much pains in instructing and enlightening his people, and in forming them to useful knowledge and wise discipline.—

"To instruct the nation is not sufficient:—in order to conduct it to happiness, it is still more neces-

inspire the people with the love of virtue and the abhorrence of vice.—

“Piety and religion have an essential influence on the happiness of a nation, and, from their importance, deserve a particular chapter,” &c. *

These sentiments of Vattel, I might confirm by reference to the most eminent writers on jurisprudence among the ancients. I shall content myself with simply quoting the following words of Calvin, in an admirable chapter of his Institutes, *de Politica Administratione*: “That the office of magistrates extends to both tables of the law, if the Scripture did not teach, might be learned from profane writers: for no one has treated of the office of magistrates, of legislation, and the state, who does not begin with religion and divine worship.” †

2dly, from Scripture. In proving from the word of God, that the proper object of Civil Government is *the good of society in the most extensive sense*, I shall say little on the approved example of the Jewish rulers, not because the objections urged to its applicability do not admit of a satisfactory refutation, but because it claims, on various accounts, to be considered under a distinct head of argument. In the thirteenth chapter of Romans, we read that the Civil Ruler is “the minister of God to his subjects *for good*,” that Rulers are “not a terror to good works, but to *the evil*,” that they are the ministers of God—revengers to execute wrath upon *them that do evil*,” and in 1

* Vattel's Law of Nations, &c. Transl. London, 1797. pp. 55—59. Prelim.; and Book I. pp. 4, 5, 47, 51, 55.

† Instit. lib. IV. cap. xx. 9.

Peter, ii., we read, that governors are sent "for the punishment of *evil doers*, and for the praise of *them that do well*." Such is the New Testament account of the direct ends of magistracy; the ultimate end of it, as of all other institutions, being, of course, the glory of God. Let any man read these accounts with attention, and with a common share of intelligence and candour, and say whether it is not the proper end of the Magistrate's office, to confer on society every kind and measure of good which he may be able to confer in the use of the means placed in his hands; and to repress every sort of crime, or overt act of wickedness injurious to society, which, in the use of the means placed in his hands, he may be able to repress. The expressions are quite indefinite, neither specifying any particular kind of good on the one hand, nor evil on the other; and nothing but express authority of other parts of Scripture can justify us in giving them a limited sense. So far, however, from finding that we have at least the *presumption* arising from the example of the Jewish rulers, to confirm the natural interpretation of the words. I really do not see how it is possible to get rid of these passages, without adopting a mode of interpretation altogether violent and arbitrary.

But the limitation in question may easily be reduced to an absurdity. Is there any such difference between the crime of theft, and that of the open circulation of blasphemy against the being and providence of God, as should place the former crime *within* the Magistrate's sphere, and the latter beyond it? Both are public wrongs, or crimes against society, and

against the one is directed more immediately against
 the other against the Creator.* Can that
 be considered as sustaining the character of
 the minister for good to his subjects, and a terror
 to evil doers, who holds that the propagation of blas-
 phemy against the God by whom kings rule, and on
 whose providence the well-being of the State is entirely
 dependent, does not fall as directly within his province
 of theft or murder? Nothing can be more arbitrary
 than the distinction sometimes drawn in this question,
 between the first and second tables of the law. There
 are things forbidden in the second table, which the power
 of a Magistrate cannot directly reach; while there
 are things forbidden in the first table, to which it is
 as clear that his power *does* extend. An example
 of the former class is found in the tenth command-
 ment which forbids covetousness, (in distinction from
 adultery, which is forbidden by the eighth.) Another
 example is found in the fifth commandment, requiring
 reverence to parents, and other superiors—a duty
 to which the Magistrate's power can hardly reach, except
 by an indirect mode of providing moral means for its
 execution. Of the latter class of offences, we have
 an example in the fourth commandment, one portion
 of which is specially directed to Magistrates,—they
 having control over the persons of the “strangers
 within the gates” of our cities.
 It is very easy to raise objections here about the

* Blackstone's Com. Book iv., where, under the head of
 Wrongs, we have, 1st, Offences against God and Religion;
 2dly, Offences against the Law of Nations; 3dly, Offences against
 the Law of the Land; and so on.

difficulty of drawing limits to the Magistrate's power in such matters. Difficulties of this kind are experienced in every great question. They are experienced not only in the class of offences against religion, in that of offences against our neighbour, in regard to which every one knows how different are the laws of different countries. It is the mark of a weak mind to be driven by difficulties of mere detail, from cardinal and well-established general principles. Let it be observed, further, that it is one thing to question the expediency of the Magistrate's interference in any particular case of crime directed immediately against God and another thing to say, that the whole affair is beyond his province. The propriety of interference must evidently vary much, according to the circumstances of each case, and of the age and country. It is, moreover, absurd to allege (as has often been done) that, if the whole of the moral law be committed to the keeping of the Magistrate, he must inflict the same punishments which formed the sanctions of the severe laws among the Jews. But I shall not occupy time in refuting this idea, since I find it given up by one of the most able of the opponents of Establishments. "Those who plead for imitating the Jewish system," says Dr Wardlaw, "should feel the obligation to imitate it consistently. I do not at present mean in the infliction of all the peculiar pains and penalties annexed to the omission or the violation of religious rites for I am aware that *principles may be obligatory, while special modes of punishment are not.*"*

* Wardlaw's Sermon, &c. p. 18

As I felt no disposition to shrink from the more delicate part of this last question—that which refers to the repressing of evil—some remarks have been made on it, although I have chiefly to do with the other part of the magistrate's duty, the promoting of religion and morals in the community, by the use of those means which have been again and again referred to. On the whole, I think, it is a matter beyond all reasonable doubt, that it is the proper end of the Magistrate's office to confer on society all and whatsoever good it may be in his power to confer, in the use of the means placed in his hands. This principle being established, it follows that it is the duty of the governing power to make use of those peculiar facilities which it enjoys, for providing the means of religious instruction. Let it be impressed upon the mind of the reader that, *independently of the Church altogether*, the magistrate has duties to discharge towards his subjects, which imperatively require that in some way or other he shall provide for their instruction in the principles of religion. Either he must do this *in alliance* with the Church, voluntarily and avowedly devolving the administration of religious instruction upon her ministers, while he grants them whatever external aid they require for the purpose, or he must do it in some legitimate manner, *in separation* from the Church.

The theory of our opponents which limits the end of Civil Government to the preservation of external peace, goes to bring down the Magistrate to the level of a mere Officer of police.* We allege, on

From this charge I must except Dr Wardlaw, who states most rectly the design of Civil Government as being—"The security of

the contrary, that God has set up Civil Rulers, and placed the resources of government in their hands, order that, by means of these resources, and acting in the spirit of Him whose ministers they are, they may promote, to the utmost of their power, the welfare of the whole society under their care. There is no limit to the good which they are entitled and bound to do, *provided* it be good indeed, and not the semblance of it only; and *provided further*, that it be conferred in such a manner as not to interfere with duties which God may have intrusted exclusively to others. These provisions will effectually guard the view of the Magistrate's office against any evil consequences to which it may be supposed to lead. Acting upon the former, the Magistrate will beware of intruding into the sphere assigned by God to Ministers, and other office-bearers of the Church, or of constituting the provision for religion on any such footing as would destroy the independence of the Church in the management of her internal affairs. In case any attempt of this nature is made, it is the duty of the Church to resist it, and rather to decline the provision of the State altogether, than sacrifice essential rights conferred upon her by Christ, her Lord, King and Head. Those writers on jurisprudence who identify the Magistrate's concern about religion with a right to nominate the Ministers of the Church and otherwise govern its affairs, overlook the in-

person, property, liberty, and life, and the promotion of general comfort, prosperity, *social confidence, and happiness.*" Sermon, p. 1
How the Dr may contrive to reconcile this statement with the exclusion of religion from the sphere of Civil Rulers, I pretend not to sa-

portant fact, that God in his Word has virtually limited the Magistrate's authority, by committing the management of affairs properly ecclesiastical to the Church, independently of all human authority. The other provision—namely, that the good aimed at be good indeed, and not the semblance of it only—will guard the Magistrate against every attempt to propagate religion by fire and sword. The nature of religion forbids this. While the Magistrate has the sword for doing one thing, he has mild and paternal methods within his reach for doing another. "It would certainly be preposterous," says Mr Ballantine in his work against Establishments, "to employ the sword or the gibbet to teach us religion,—just as preposterous as to employ a psalm or a sermon to repel the aggressions of a conqueror, or punish the criminality of a murderer; but where is the necessity of the Magistrate's acting so absurdly? May he not adopt enlightened and rational measures in regard to religion as well as in regard to trade or commerce?"*

FOURTHLY. I proceed to a fourth head of argument for the duty of Civil Rulers to endow the Church. It is a dictate of the law of nature, again and again republished in Scripture, that each man shall do for others whatever their wants require, and which he can do for them, without neglecting the duty he owes to himself. It is the same rule which is expressed in the Larger Catechism thus, (Q. 99.) "That in what is commanded to others, we are bound, according to our places and callings, to be helpful to them." According to the same rule, it must be the

* Ballantine's Comparison, &c. p. 45.

duty of *societies* of men to contribute every thing their power to each other's happiness and perfection for the union of men in society does not set them free from the moral law,—a society being in fact a moral person, whose will is the result of the united wills of the individuals, and so remains subject to the same moral law which binds the individuals. Hence arise those great duties which independent nations owe each other. Besides many duties of perfect obligation, to the performance of which the law of nations warrants one State to compel another, there are duties of imperfect obligation, which one nation owes another, and which, though they cannot be exacted, are binding just as really, and on the very same principles, as are obligations of the same class among individuals. For example, if a nation is afflicted with famine, other nations which have provisions to spare are bound to relieve its distress. To give aid in such cases is so manifestly required by the dictates of humanity, that in point of fact the duty is seldom neglected by any civilized nation. Again, a learned nation, if applied to for teachers in the sciences by another nation shaking off its barbarism, is under an obligation of the imperfect class to comply with the request. In short, it is not in the power of men, by dividing themselves into different bodies, to break the ties of that universal society which has been established among them by Him who “of one blood hath made all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth.” The application of all this to the matter before us is obvious. The simple fact, that the Church, like the State, is a society constituted for certain important

ends, upon principles legitimate and approved of God, lays the State under obligation to give to the Church whatever she stands in need of, and which the State can give without sacrificing its own welfare. In this case, just as in that of independent *nations*, there is a reciprocal obligation of the same nature as exists among individual persons. If it is a principle of the moral law, "that, in what is commanded to others, we are bound, according to our places and callings, to be helpful to them," it follows that, in what God has commanded to the Church, the State is bound, according to its place, to be helpful to her. And this holds good, independently of the fact which formed the basis of our first head of argument,—that the Church is a society pre-eminently dear in God's sight, and so a society, in the forwarding of whose interests the State gives a most suitable token of its regard for the honour of Him who is its own creator, governor, and benefactor; independently also of the fact which formed the basis of the second and third heads of argument,—namely, that in endowing the Church, the State is really doing its own work, and most effectually fulfilling the ends of its own appointment. But when all these things are taken together, it is difficult to conceive a stronger case than is made out for the obligation of the State, to make use of the peculiar facilities which it enjoys for providing the means of religious instruction.

FIFTHLY. A fifth argument for the duty of Rulers to provide the means of religious instruction, and one which to my mind appears of such strength that were there no other the duty might be rested upon it alone,

is drawn from the nature of those functions ~~wh~~ long to the *judicial* power in the State. That power belongs the awfully important duty of pronouncing judgment upon criminals, even to whereby they are sent into the presence of God Judge of all, to render an account at his trial. Who does not shudder at the cruelty involved in the inflicting of such a punishment, while provision is not made for imbuing the minds of all classes of the people with the fear of God, with sound religious principles, and with that sense of responsibility before the divine tribunal, by which alone they can escape the real demerit of crime, and be effectually restrained from the commission of it? As to scripture, everywhere connects the application of the rod with the use of instruction. But, indeed, what need of scripture on a point on which reason speaks so loudly a voice? Unless the State is prepared to pursue a system of cruelty towards its subjects, as foolishly, as respects the welfare of the country, as large, it *must* provide for the teaching of religious principles. A similar argument may be drawn from the use of oaths in the State. For the State to require its subjects to swear judicially, without providing for their instruction in those principles of religion on which the solemnity of an oath depends, is injustice and cruelty towards those who are called to swear, not to say so as respects the general welfare of the country.

But if it is thus the paramount duty of the State to see that the people be instructed in the principles of religion, need I repeat that the principle of an alliance with, and endowment of the C

follows immediately,—of an *alliance*, at all events, inasmuch as the State, if it leave the matter to the Church at all, can only do so in the way of voluntarily and avowedly devolving it upon her, as most competent to effect the object,—of an endowment also, unless we are prepared for the ridiculous anomaly of the State devolving upon the Church a certain work of its own, yet not furnishing her with the means which are peculiarly at its command for accomplishing the work. A similar train of remarks might be made in regard to the *Sabbath*, supposing it granted that, on any grounds whatever, it is the duty of the State to command a weekly cessation from labour. On any other supposition than that the people, when discharged from labour on the Sabbath, have an opportunity of attending upon the ordinances of religion, and are brought under the operation of means for drawing their attention to spiritual concerns, a protected Sabbath were nothing better than a premium on sloth and wickedness. As, therefore, it was before observed that no statute could be made to tally with itself or with common sense, which, laying out of view the spiritual ends of the Sabbath, should enjoin its observance on secular grounds merely, so now I have to add, that all sound legislation for the observance of the Sabbath, imperatively demands an ample provision of means for the religious instruction of the people on the day of rest.

SIXTHLY. It will not be denied that it is the duty of our Rulers to maintain *National Schools* throughout the country. If any one, granting this, shall deny that religion ought to form part of the instruction

there communicated, I will enter into no argument with that person. But supposing this *also* granted then let it be observed, that the duty of rulers to provide the means of religious instruction is conceded. But does the principle of an endowment of *the Church* follow from this? Let us see. There are just two principles on which the provision for religion in the schools can be constituted; either first, that of leaving the patrons or chief supporters of each school to teach them whatever religion they please, or secondly, that appointing, that the religious instruction be communicated according to some fixed standard of doctrine which has been previously recognised by the State, both scriptural, and calculated most effectually to accomplish the ends contemplated. The latter method I need scarcely say, is that which has for centuries been pursued in the parish schools and universities of Scotland,—with what utility, it does not belong to this part of the argument to inquire, though inquiry on that head may perhaps be deemed superfluous. What I have to request the reader's attention to is that, of the two systems, this is the only one which the Scriptures will warrant. If the State is to give its funds for the teaching of religion at all, it is both irrational and grossly unscriptural that the matter be left to the contingency of this or that person's opinions being scriptural or heretical, fitted to benefit or to injure them. The provision is opposed to the Word of God, unless means be taken to secure, that the religion taught be the religion of Christ. This, however, is virtually to endow the Church. It matters not that the funds

t in this case come into the hands of her *ministers*; they constitute a national support of her doctrines, and promotion of her peculiar ends. In short, if rulers are not to be allowed to provide the means of religious instruction, then religion must be excluded from our national schools altogether. But if religion is to be taught there, it must be the religion of Christ and his kingdom, and so the Church must be nationally endowed, unless we are prepared to give the minds of the country indifferently for the teaching of Socinianism, Popery, or pure Christianity, as it may happen. That this last supposition is no fancy, America furnishes lamentable proof. Harvard College, for example, in the neighbourhood of Boston, which is allowed to be at the head of the literary institutions of the New World, which is the oldest and most amply endowed of them all, and which, besides its academical advantages, has a law, medical, and *theological* school,—this university is in the hands of Unitarians. Thus in the chief literary institution of America, Christianity is subverted at the public expense. The truth is, there is no getting rid of a national provision for religion in some shape. If there is no provision for the Church *as such*, there must still be a provision (as all Americans allow) for schools in which religion is taught. Whatever difficulties on the head of conscience can be alleged against the endowment of the Church, lie equally against taxing people for the support *in schools* of a religion which they know. If our opponents think it any consolation in this hardship, that others are obliged in their turn to support *their* religion, they are heartily welcome to this source of comfort.

SEVENTHLY. I proceed to draw a seventh scriptural argument for the duty of rulers to provide the means of religious instruction, from the maintenance which God appointed for the Levitical priesthood, under the Old Testament. As to the nature of this maintenance, it may suffice for the present to say in general, that it consisted of tithes, certain portions of the offerings made in the temple, and forty-eight cities assigned for the residence of the Priests and Levites, with their suburbs. It is well known that our opponents deny the applicability of the argument drawn from this source altogether; and as we cheerfully acknowledge that there were many important peculiarities in the case, it will be right, and will also clear the way for apprehending distinctly the true nature of the argument, to take notice at the outset, of the grounds on which they insist upon casting aside altogether the example of the national establishment of religion among the Jews. These grounds I shall state in the words of Dr Wallis, quoting as much as appears sufficient to give a fair representation of his views. Having given a statement of the argument for establishments from the case of the Jews, he proceeds, "I would repeat (namely to the question, why may not the example be imitated?) "by observing,—In the *first* place, the cause, unfortunately, such imitation is, in the nature of the thing, *impossible*.—It is a case that comes within the range of the imitable. The only imitation possible must be on the part of God himself. He must repeat his own act. The Jewish constitution was a theocracy, in which Jehovah assumed to treat his people a special relation,—a relation which he ne-

ed to any other portion of our race,—the relation of their King,—himself conducting the administration of their government, by a system of supernatural revelation, and immediate manifestation of his power and authority. Who but Jehovah himself could institute this? He must select another Abraham,—and of his seed a nation,—separate that nation to itself as a peculiar people,—and, regarding the nation collectively considered, as his Church, and prescribe for it the ordinances of an exclusive worship, and prescribe for it its civil constitution and laws. To talk of imitation, in a case so thoroughly original, or to call that imitation, in which the very thing imitated is of necessity wanting, a case of absurdity. It must be God's doing, and not man's. The Jewish was a temporary system, ordained for special ends; and, these ends being once fulfilled, it was never meant to be, and it never can be, repeated.——But, *Secondly*, Not to imitate, on this account, out of the question,—an attempt to imitate, under the Christian dispensation, is in direct contravention of the intimated will of Jehovah, and a frustration of his avowed designs. It is to go back, not forward. It is to frustrate, as I said, the very purpose of God, by making the Jewish the model of the New.——*Fourthly*, Those who are imitating the Jewish system, should feel the obligation to imitate it *consistently*.——I refer to the Jews, on their principles, of giving the national law the same extent of comprehensiveness which it enjoyed amongst the people of Israel. The nation and its laws were, in regard to the members included in

them, convertible terms ; so that, to be a political body was, at the same time, to be ecclesiastical."

It is not a little surprising that a Theologian of Dr Wardlaw's eminence should think of drawing argument from the national establishment among the Jews, with such loose generalities. Surely Dr Wardlaw has not so mean an opinion of his opponents, as to suppose them ignorant that the Jews lived under a Theocracy, or drawing from this fact the conclusion, that the Jewish constitution is no *model* for the Christian Church. neither can he require to be told, that after it has been conceded, there is room left for an application of Old Testament enactments to the Christian Church, without going at all back to the principles of Judaism. In the first epistle to the Corinthians, ninth chapter, we find these words : " I am not a warfare any time at his own charge. I planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock and eateth of the milk of the flock? Say I these things as I do not keep the law the same also? For it is not the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is done, that he that ploweth should plow in hope, and he that thrasheth in hope should be partaker of the hope.—Do ye not know, that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple, and they which wait at the altar are par-

ar? Even so hath the Lord ordained, that which preach the gospel should live of the
 "Now, I do not say that the Apostle is going for a national establishment of religion ; is beyond doubt inferring a certain right of *an* ministers *from the institutions of the Levitical* One of the laws of the *theocracy* he makes the a great Christian duty. Upon Dr Wardlaw's es, however, the false teachers who had made the Apostle, ought to have replied to his reason- that "the Jewish constitution was a theocracy, in Jehovah assumed to that people a special ;" that "to talk of imitation in a case so thorp-eculiar, was the height of absurdity;" that "it frustrate the very purpose of God by making d the model of the New;" and that those who is length, must, in consistency, go certain other

The Apostle, however, was no stranger to that the Jews lived under a theocracy : none led more strenuously than he for the abrogation ceremonial law, the priesthood, the sacrifices, ole appurtenances of Judaism, by the manifes- of Christ ; and it is obvious therefore, that there e a principle at the bottom of his reasoning e Levitical law, capable of being followed out her cases, and perfectly consistent with the ion of Judaism. It is not difficult to see is principle is. *In so far as enactments in the ial or judicial law can be shown to rest, not on ial and temporary, but on moral and permanent s, they are for ever binding.* I need hardly say

1 Cor. ix. 7—14.

H

them, convertible terms ; so that, to belong to a political body was, at the same time, to belong to an ecclesiastical."

It is not a little surprising that a Theologian of Dr Wardlaw's eminence should think of meeting his argument from the national establishment of religion among the Jews, with such loose generalities as these. Surely Dr Wardlaw has not so mean an opinion of his opponents, as to suppose them ignorant of the fact that the Jews lived under a Theocracy, or incapable of drawing from this fact the conclusion, that the Jewish constitution is no *model* for the Christian church. neither can he require to be told, that after this has been conceded, there is room left for an extensive application of Old Testament enactments to the Christian church, without going at all back to the peculiarities of Judaism. In the first epistle to the Corinthians ninth chapter, we find these words : " Who is a warfare any time at his own charges ? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof ? or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock ? Say I these things as a man saith not the law the same also ? For it is written the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God care for oxen ? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes ? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written that he that ploweth should plow in hope ; and he that thraresheth in hope should be partaker of the hope.—Do ye not know, that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple ; and they which wait at the altar are partakers of the offerings on the altar ? "

the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel.* Now, I do not say that the Apostle is here arguing for a national establishment of religion; but he is beyond doubt inferring a certain right of *Christian ministers from the institutions of the Levitical law*. One of the laws of the *theocracy* he makes the basis of a great Christian duty. Upon Dr Wardlaw's principles, however, the false teachers who had maligned the Apostle, ought to have replied to his reasoning,—that “the Jewish constitution was a theocracy, in which Jehovah assumed to that people a special relation;” that “to talk of imitation in a case so thoroughly peculiar, was the height of absurdity;” that “it was to frustrate the very purpose of God by making the Old the model of the New;” and that those who went this length, must, in consistency, go certain other lengths. The Apostle, however, was no stranger to the fact that the Jews lived under a theocracy: none contended more strenuously than he for the abrogation of the ceremonial law, the priesthood, the sacrifices, and whole appurtenances of Judaism, by the manifestation of Christ; and it is obvious therefore, that there must be a principle at the bottom of his reasoning from the Levitical law, capable of being followed out into other cases, and perfectly consistent with the abrogation of Judaism. It is not difficult to see what this principle is. *In so far as enactments in the ceremonial or judicial law can be shown to rest, not on ceremonial and temporary, but on moral and permanent grounds, they are for ever binding.* I need hardly say

1 Cor. ix. 7—14.

that this simple principle at once explains the Apostle's reasoning. The reasons which led to the providing of a suitable maintenance for the Jewish priesthood, were not of a temporary or ceremonial kind, but were alike applicable to the case of Christian ministers, who, like them, were called to devote themselves to sacred duties, and could not do this unless suitably maintained. As, therefore, argues the Apostle, "they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple, even so hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel." It is melancholy to be obliged, at this time of day, to lay down with so much formality a principle which may be regarded as among the most fixed points in theology, and is to be found in every good system. As one example out of many, I may quote the following words from the Confession of Faith, chap. xix. § 4. "To them also (the people of Israel) as a body politic, God gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the state of the people, not obliging any other now, *further than the general equity thereof may require.*"

It is upon this principle, then, that we argue from the case of the national establishment of religion among the Jews, to the case before us. We do not say that, simply because there was a national establishment among the Jews, it follows that there ought to be one among us. Neither do we take it for granted, that there is such an analogy between the grounds on which God legislated in the case of the Jewish priesthood, and those on which we claim the support of the Christian ministry by the State, as will warrant our

arguing from the one case to the other. The fact of the analogy has to be proved. It has to be shown that those enactments of the Jewish law on which the present question hinges, did not rest on ceremonial and temporary, but on moral and permanent grounds : and if this cannot be made out, then this argument for an Establishment falls to the ground. But it will not do to cut the whole matter short by general statements about a theocracy, and the peculiarities of the Old Testament economy.—How then does this matter stand ? So far as respects the right of Christian ministers to a suitable maintenance *from some quarter*, we know that the analogy holds between their case and that of the Jewish priesthood, because the apostle Paul reasons on this supposition : and now the question is, Does the analogy extend to the placing of the maintenance on some such footing of law, as shall not leave it to depend upon the varying feelings and circumstances of individuals, but shall insure both its sufficiency and its permanency ?

This question must, I think, be answered in the affirmative, unless it can be shown either that there is less reason for placing the due maintenance of Christian ordinances upon a secure and permanent footing, than there was in regard to the Jewish ordinances ; or, that there is something in the nature of the Gospel dispensation, *as distinguished from the Jewish*, which renders the due maintenance of Christian ordinances independent of all other security than is found in the abilities and the feelings of individuals. The former position, however, cannot be held, without running into the absurdities of Quakerism. In pro-

portion as the Gospel dispensation is more excellent in its nature, and more extensive in its design than the Jewish, in the same proportion it would seem to be even *greater* importance to have the due maintenance of Christian ordinances placed on a footing of stability. Nor can I help adding, that there were dangers connected with the security given to the Levitical priesthood arising from the fact of the priesthood being hereditary, which do not apply to the case of the Christian ministry. Is there any thing, then, in the Gospel dispensation as distinguished from the Jewish, which renders the due maintenance of Christian ordinance independent of any other security than is found in the feelings and abilities of individuals? Here it is enough simply to recur to the propositions which were laid down as the basis of our scriptural argument, and to repeat, that the planting and suitably maintaining of a Gospel ministry in every part of the country, (independently of the duty of sending the Gospel to the heathen,) requires pecuniary aid to such an amount, as has never yet been raised in any country, with or without the aid of an Establishment. If our opponents are not satisfied with this, let them prove the peculiarity they allege in the Gospel dispensation.

If it should be urged as a peculiarity affecting the analogy in question, that the tribe of Levi had naturally the same right with the other tribes to a share in the promised land, and that independently, therefore of religious objects, their peculiar privileges were but a fair compensation for the loss of this political right,—I answer, that the same thing applies substantially to Christian ministers, who, by devoting themselves

wholly to sacred duties for the good of mankind, do thereby deprive themselves of those secular honours and emoluments to which their industry and talents would otherwise have entitled them. It is but justice, that a body of men devoting their time and talents at the call of God to the public good, should both be furnished with a maintenance becoming their station, and should have that maintenance placed upon a secure and permanent footing. Reason combines with the enactments of God under the Old Testament, in teaching this; or rather, to speak more properly, reason teaches that the grounds of those enactments were not of a temporary and ceremonial, but of a moral and permanent kind. I have no doubt that ingenuity will suggest to our opponents various points of difference between the cases here compared, by which they may endeavour to escape the force of the analogy. But minor points of difference will not affect an analogical argument resting on a resemblance in substantials. They would not be without a show of argument, were they to attempt to get rid of the analogy which Paul institutes between the Christian ministry and the Jewish priesthood, by alleging, for example, that while the Jewish system was from its nature expensive, and required its ministers to devote themselves exclusively to its complicated services, the simplicity of Christianity places its ministers upon a very different footing, and renders it possible for them to perform their duties, while they maintain themselves by a trade. This petty sort of reasoning, however, has no weight with Paul, who seizes hold of the grand points of resemblance, and

on these constructs his argument, passing by minor points of difference.*

It may not be improper, however, to notice an objection which the writers on the other side are a

* If the reader shall derive as much amusement as I have do from the following strictures of Mr Marshall upon the analogical argument from the case of the Jewish priesthood, he will not find fault with the space it occupies. "Would not the argument, admitted, go to the restoration of something like Judaism in all its branches, and is there not a danger of those who use such an argument, falling under the condemnation of that class of persons whom the Apostle says, that Christ had become to them of 'no effect?' Besides, may not the absurdity of such an argument be demonstrated by applying it to a multitude of other cases? For instance, the holy anointing oil with which the priests, the tabernacle, and the sacred furniture were anointed, although the article itself might not be manufactured, yet might not very specious reasons have been alleged for making one similar? Might not some Jew, whose heart rejoiced in ointments and perfumes, adopting the argument of the Seceder and his confederates, have said—to be sure we are forbidden to make this compound, or to apply it to any common use, but may we not make another like it? May we not, by leaving out some of the ingredients, or by altering some of the proportions, by taking less or more of the cassia, for instance, or less or more of the calamus, or of the cinnamon, or of the myrrh—may we not in this way, with a little of the art of the apothecary, make an excellent ointment useful for many purposes, and have we not the *analogy* of the divine example to warrant us? The answer to such a reasoner would have been ready, 'neither shall ye make any other *like* it after the composition of it.' 'Whosoever compoundeth any *like* it, shall even be cut off from among his people.'" Mr Marshall gives another example, no less applicable than the anointing oil to the matter in hand; but I am reminded of the words of Michaelis, which it were well if all authors would conscientiously bear in mind: "I might here have named forty-eight cities; but my paper, for which my readers must pay, is too valuable to be occupied with such a list."

† Eccl. Est. considered, pp. 72, 73.

ed to urge with great triumph, against ap-
 the example of the Jewish Establishment to
 nal provision for Christianity. I give it in the
 of the Edinburgh Theological Magazine, as
 by Mr Marshall—"If God interpose to estab-
 particular modification of religion, we have an
 le assurance of its truth and excellence; but can
 n potentate afford a similar assurance when he
 ses?" To this I answer that Christianity and Ju-
 est alike on the authority of God. If you reply,
 ut the nation may err in their ideas of what
 anity is,—the answer to this is no less obvious,
 ither were the Jewish kings and ordinary re-
 teachers infallible, but very frequently supported
 ight a religion far different from that which God
 en forth: a Jew, therefore, who happened to
 n opinion from the Rulers or Priesthood of his
 ight just as well have objected against the Es-
 tablishment under which he lived, that, though God had
 orth truth only, he was required by them to sup-
 port what he believed to be error. The answer to this
 on would have been, that in bringing a charge
 on ground against *the principle* of the Establish-
 ment under which he lived, he was charging error upon
 since nothing could secure an Establishment
 objections of this nature, but infallibility in
 official acts, both of rulers and teachers. *We*
 titled to the benefit of the same answer. You
 that though God gave forth Christianity un-
 with error, you are required to support under
 ne of Christianity what you believe to be false.
 ply, that though God had expressly commanded

the nation to establish Christianity, this would not have secured the Establishment against the objection which you urge against it.

Before leaving the present head of argument, it will be necessary to take notice of a very strange and novel attempt which Dr Wardlaw has made to get rid of the argument drawn from the Jewish Establishment, by alleging that the support of Judaism itself was "left to the impulses of individual charity. "The Lord," says he, "appears to have placed the requisition of the tithe on the very same footing with the requisition of kindness to the stranger, and liberality to the widow and the fatherless. In the latter case there were commands; but they were commands accompanied by no compulsory assessment, leviable by legal force. All was left to the impulses of individual charity, while Jehovah avowed himself the Patron of the needy, and the judicial avenger of their wrongs. So was it, it would appear, in the former. And the whole of the Old Testament records are in harmony with this view of the fact. Was it by compulsory taxation that the tabernacle was reared in the wilderness? Was it not, on the contrary, by the free-will offerings of a people whose cheerful contributions, &c. And was it by legal impost in the days of David and Solomon, that the temple, in all its costly magnificence, was erected? No: it was still by the gift of spontaneous liberality."* Now, it might be enough for my purpose, passing by the matter of the tithe altogether, to remind the reader of an important fact

* Sermon, pp. 17, 18.

the provision for the Levitical priesthood, of which Wardlaw does not give his readers the most remote hint, namely, that God commanded no less than forty-eight cities, with two or three thousand cubits of land around each, to be set apart for the residence of Priests and Levites throughout the land of Israel. Beyond all doubt, these residences were secured to the ministers of religion by the power of the Civil Ruler ; but, by the way, they were not *mere* residences ; for from the produce of the " fields of the suburbs," arose the means of the subsistence of the Priests and Levites, when they were not in waiting at the sanctuary. Supposing, therefore, that, in regard to the tithes and other offerings, the case had stood as Dr Wardlaw supposes, enough would still remain to warrant the analogy which the present argument is built. But it is most certain that the case did not stand in regard to these, Dr Wardlaw holds. Every plain reader of his Bible knows that the tithes and offerings *belonged of right* to the Priest, having been made over to him by God ; and that to withhold them was not merely *unkindness*, but *robbery*. As to the tithes, I shall select one passage out of many,—“ And the Lord spake unto Aaron, thou shalt have no inheritance in their land, neither shalt thou have any part among them : I am thy part and thine inheritance among the children of Israel. And behold, *I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance, for their service which they serve*, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation.—It shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations, that among the children of Israel they have no inheritance. But the

tithes of the children of Israel, which they of heave-offering unto the Lord, *I have given Levites to inherit: therefore* I have said unto you. Among the children of Israel they shall have inheritance.”* Is this leaving all to “spontaneous liberality,”—to the “impulses of individual charity?” So far from it, that expressions could have been used more strongly conveying the idea of property, a right too, conferred in *consideration of service given for it*. The whole is matter of law between man and man. On the subject of offerings I select the following passage, “And ye shall burn the fat upon the altar; but the breast shall be Aaron’s and his sons. And the right shoulder shall ye give unto the priest for an heave-offering of the sacrifices of your peace-offerings. He and his sons of Aaron, that offereth the blood of the offerings, and the fat, shall have the right shoulder for his part. For the wave-breast and right shoulder have I taken of the children of Israel, of the sacrifices of their peace-offerings, and have given them unto Aaron the priest, and unto his sons, as a statute for ever, from among the children of Israel.”† This leaving all to “spontaneous liberality,” or to the impulses of “individual charity?” Was not the priest entitled, in terms of the law, to *retain* the breast which he had burned the fat upon the altar? And let the reader observe a specimen of a divine in “spontaneous liberality,” between which and the just quoted, the contrast is too remarkable

*Numbers xviii. 20—24.

† Lev. vii. 3

rd of comment. "And the Lord spake unto s, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, that bring me an offering : of every man that giveth lingly with his heart ye shall take my offering. this is the offering which ye shall take of them ; and silver, and brass, &c."* Accordingly we read Moses gathered 'all the children of Israel together, aid unto them, " This is the thing which the Lord anded, saying, take ye from among you an offer- unto the Lord : whosoever is of a willing heart, m bring it, an offering of the Lord ; gold, and sil- and brass, &c."† Such is a specimen of the " gifts ontaneous liberality," on the one hand, and of a or right of property constituted by law, in con- tion of service done, upon the other.

hese *taxes*," says Jennings, " namely, the tithes, acrificial offerings, and the poll-tax of the half l, (whether annual or occasional,) are all the expressly levied by the Mosaic law. We read, l, of an extraordinary contribution for the build- f the tabernacle, which God ordered Moses to mend to the people, *Exod.* xxv. 2. However, was not in the nature of a tax, but a free gift, one giving as he pleased."‡ " In the first " says Michaelis,§ " the Levites received the of all the fields and herds for their support. tithe alone merited the name of a tax ; but it was y fair one, because the tribe of Levi had no land- perty, and yet actually performed such import-

* *Exod.* xxv. 1, 2, 3.

† *Exod.* xxxv. 4, 5.

‡ *Jenning's Jewish Antiquities*, p. 58. Ed. 1825.

§ *Laws of Moses*, Art. 192.

ant services in the Israelitish state, as justly entitled them to liberal remuneration." Having again spoken of the first tithe as of the nature of a tax or impost, Michaelis proceeds thus: "Upon the whole, it was the wish of Moses to make the tithe as little burdensome as possible on the conscience and liberty of his people. The payment and appreciation of them he left to their own consciences without subjecting them to judicial or sacerdotal variations, but, at the same time, without prohibiting Levites from taking care that they duly received what was their own." From this last clause it is manifest that Michaelis not only regarded the tithes as the lawful *property* of the Levites, but held that, in the event of their being kept back, they were not prevented from vindicating their right. His meaning, therefore, in the first part of the sentence is, that Moses, unwilling to encourage a rigorous exaction of taxes of this description, did not appoint that they should be paid on the footing of an annual appreciation by the priest or the magistrate, but left the matter, in the first instance, to the people's consciences, (not their free will,) "at the same time, without prohibiting the Levites from taking care that they duly received what was their own." Supposing, however, we could show that legal steps had ever been taken to make good the right of the priests, this would not affect the question before us, because not only does Dr Wardlaw assume but his argument depends on his being able to prove that the whole was matter of spontaneous liberal bounty which assuredly was not the case if a right of property was vested in the Levites. If the tithes and of

things were their property, then *no principles of justice, or rights of conscience*, could be violated by enforcing of the right in the way of civil process. His might, indeed, be in general deemed needless & inexpedient, from the general willingness of the people to pay, the evils apt to arise from a rigorous collection of taxes of this description, and the supernatural means by which, under a theocracy, such rights, been extensively trampled upon, were by God himself indicated ; nor will it be very difficult to account in this way for Moses laying down no rules for the civil enforcement of the right, as well as for the fact that a comparatively of this nature is found on record in the history of Israel. But I repeat, that no man, without the utmost absurdity, have complained of injustice or a violation of his rights of conscience, if he been compelled to deliver up what was not his own.

We are not, however, without evidence that legal judgments were occasionally taken, and that with the express approbation of God, to make good the right in question. In the account of Hezekiah's reformation, we are told as follows: "Moreover, he *commanded* the people that dwelt in Jerusalem to give the portion of tithes to the priests and the Levites, that they might be encouraged to observe the law of the Lord. And as soon as the commandment came abroad, the children of Israel brought in abundance the first-fruits," &c.* To what extent Hezekiah might have thought it expedient to enforce the commandment upon the refractory, had there been any such, I know not. But certainly his

* 2 Chron. xxxi. 4, 5.

giving forth a commandment at all, implies that he considered himself entitled to see to its being obeyed. In the thirteenth chapter of Nehemiah, we find the following words: "And I perceived that the portions of the Levites had not been given them: for the Levites the singers that did the work were fled every one to his field. Then I contended with the rulers, and said, Why is the house of God forsaken? And I gathered them together and set them in their places. Then I brought all Judah the tithe of the corn, and of the new wine, and the oil unto the treasuries."* Had the people contemptuously refused to bring in the tithe, I see no reason to doubt that Nehemiah would have adopted some such measures to enforce his command as he employed in regard to other matters belonging to the external service of God. In both these instances, moreover, permanent overseers were appointed to see to the faithful collection and management of offerings.

I have only further to observe on this most uncountable paragraph of Dr Wardlaw's Sermon, that it leads the reader to imagine, that *from first to last* "gifts of spontaneous liberality" were exclusively employed in the service of God under the Old Testament. In addition to what has been already said, I have to remind the reader, that again and again the revenues of Heathen states, levied of course by their priests in the usual manner, were employed for this purpose. "In later times too," says the Doctor in closing this head of his argument, "all the offerings cast

* Nehemiah xiii. 10—12.

the treasury of the temple were of the same voluntary description, and by this means, they *became tests of the existence, and measures of the amount, of rectitude of principle and generosity of disposition.*" Perhaps the reference here is to the free-will offerings of the Pharisees in the days of our Lord!

EIGHTHLY. An eighth scriptural argument for the duty of Rulers to provide the means of religious instruction, is drawn from the approved example of the rulers of Israel in promoting religion. We do not of course say, that the example of the kings of Israel, taken in its details, is a model for the rulers of other countries, any more than that the Jewish system generally was designed to be a model for a Christian people. But we say that, abstracting from the approved conduct of Jewish magistrates so much as may have arisen out of their peculiar circumstances, what remains is binding on Christian rulers. As those enactments in the judicial law which were founded upon reasons of general equity are neither more nor less than divinely authorized expositions or applications of the moral law, and therefore universally binding, so the divinely approved conduct of Jewish rulers, in as far as it did not arise out of their peculiar circumstances, is just the embodying of that moral law in living characters, the more deeply to impress its requirements upon the mind.

This argument, like the previous one, we find Dr. Wardlaw dismissing in the most summary manner, deeming it enough to say, that "the institution of the kingly government was not a cessation of the theocracy;" and, "that the kingly office in Israel was,

like the priestly, typical."* As to the form-
 ment, the question just returns, with what show
 son can it be maintained, that the care in gener-
 cised by the rulers of Israel about religion *bel*
the peculiarities of the theocracy? I take it for
 that religion is of all things the most conduciv
 good of man as well in this world as the nee
 without some measure of it, indeed, society
 long exist; and that, in every country, rule
 sess means for promoting it which are not
 the reach of their subjects. These facts, in
 dently of what was urged under a former he
 the New Testament, are enough to warrant a
 presumption at least, that the care of the Jew
 gistrates about religion was not a peculiarity
 theocracy, but was founded on reasons of a mo
 permanent nature. It lies with our oppon
 throw off this presumption if they can, or
 mit that the fact of the theocracy proves not
 the purpose.

If it be alleged that, in consequence of th
 cracy, nothing more fell to the lot of the Jewis
 than the "simple enforcement of the laws in
 by Moses," and hence that their conduct can
 example to rulers who have to make laws f
 subjects, I reply in the first place, that if, by t
 ple enforcement of the laws of Moses, be me
 carrying into execution definite measures pre
 by him, this was by no means all that fell to
 of the Jewish princes. Every one knows that, i
 berless instances, they had to exercise their ju

* Sermon, p. 14.

he measures which the spirit of the laws require which the laws did not and could not define. we read that Jehoshaphat "in the third year of his reign sent to his princes, to Ben-hail, and to Obadiah, and to Zechariah, to teach in the cities of Judah. with them he sent Levites, even Shemaiah and Azariah, &c. Levites, and with them Elishama and Jehoram, Priests. And they taught in Judah, and gave the book of the law of the Lord with them, and went about through all the cities of Judah, and taught the people."* For thus acting, Jehoshaphat had no authority, so far as appears from the history, but the general authority and duty which we assert is due to every ruler, to take all reasonable measures for promoting the knowledge and fear of God among the people. Mr Marshall, indeed, asserts with as much confidence as if the text had declared it, that on this occasion, (when, as he very coolly says, Jehoshaphat seem to have exceeded the ordinary limits of royal duty,) he had "a prophet for his counsel-

The history, however, affords not a shadow of ground for the assertion. But supposing that he had acted by the immediate authority of God, we now to observe in the second place, that we do not see how this would have affected the obligation of the example at all. I cannot see that the energy of a good action makes the example of it less binding, than the approval of it after it has been done. There are some actions, indeed, recorded in the Old Testament, which, *from their peculiar nature*, it would have been unwarrantable to do without the express

* 2 Chron. xvii. 7, 8, 9.

† Eccl. Est. p. 86.

authority of God, and which it would be unwarrantable to copy without the same authority. But it is ridiculous to allege that the *mere fact of God enjoining an action* upon a ruler of Israel destroy its obligation as an example. On the contrary the command rather affords a presumption in favour of the obligation, although in each case the nature of the action must be considered, in order to determine the matter with accuracy. In this case of Jehoshaphat, no reason whatever can be drawn from the nature of the action, to show that it would have been unwarrantable in Jehoshaphat to do it, or that it would be unlawful in Christian rulers to copy it, without the express authority of God. And therefore, had it been as true as we have reason to believe it false, that Jehoshaphat acted by advice of a prophet, his example would still have been binding on Christian rulers.

As for the other plea by which Dr Wardlaw and his friends endeavour to get rid of the argument before us, namely, "that the kingly office in Israel was, like the priestly, typical," there are few arguments in a controversy which have been more triumphantly repelled than this. In the year 1807, Dr Mc'Crie gave the following answer to it. "The plea that the Jewish rulers were types of Christ, will not prove that the power which they exercised about religion was altogether peculiar, and in no way exemplary. It will not be easily proved that they were all types of Christ or that the magistratical, or even regal office among that people was typical. Besides, they were types of Christ in acting about civil as well as religious matters. David has usually been considered as a type of

Christ in subduing the Philistines, as well as in bringing the ark to Zion ; and Solomon, in the wise administration of justice among his people, and in the peace which he granted to them, as well as in building the temple. This suggests another remark, which is commonly overlooked in declamations respecting a typical nation and church. The circumstance of actions being in one view typical, is not inconsistent with their being, in another view, moral and exemplary. Joseph may be viewed as a type of Christ, in feeding his father and brethren ; but did he not, by the same act, give an eminent example of filial and fraternal affection and duty ? While David is viewed as a type of Christ in subduing the enemies of Israel, did he not also discharge a moral duty in defending his subjects ? and may not his example be used, to prove that all wars are not unlawful ?”

I am not aware that any reply to these answers was attempted, until something very similar to them was advanced a few years ago by an able writer in reply to Mr M'Gavin, who had dwelt much upon the typical character of the Jewish kings in his *Letters to a Covenanter*. If any one will read pp. 93—98 of the “*Letters to a Covenanter*,” we will find that Mr M'Gavin does not touch at all either upon the *second* or *third* of the answers given in the paragraph just quoted. His remarks are confined to the first, which, of the three, is certainly the one most open to a plausible reply, namely, the deficiency of proof that all the kings of Israel were typical. It is not worth while to spend time in inquiring, whether Mr M'Gavin has disposed of this point suc-

carefully or not. The other two heads of answer he leaves untouched. Next comes the discussion between Mr Marshall and two writers in the Christian Instructor. I can hardly ask the reader to labour through pp. 75—86 of Mr Marshall's volume; but if he does take this trouble, he will find that, amidst a great deal of confident assertion, vain-glorious triumphing over others, and useless reiteration of common-place thoughts, the whole amounts at the very best to a meagre proof that the kingly office in Israel was typical. "We beg leave to inform Dr Burns," says Mr Marshall, "that *all* the judges, and all the kings, and all the subordinate magistrates of Israel, were *indeed* designed to be alike typical." Mr Marshall does not, however, make even an attempt to meet either the *second* of Dr M'Crie's arguments—that the Jewish rulers were types of Christ in civil as well as in religious matters, so that if their approved conduct be not exemplary in regard to religion, because they were types of Christ, no more can their approved conduct in the exercise of justice between man and man; or the *third* of them, namely, that the circumstance of actions being in one view typical, is not inconsistent with their being in another view moral and exemplary. Last of all comes Dr Wardlaw's Sermon, where the whole matter is disposed of in six lines, neither of these answers being touched upon. I have only, therefore, to re-advance them, persuaded that they are not only unanswered, but unanswerable. The examples cited by Dr M'Crie at the close of the paragraph might easily be multiplied. From the approved conduct, then, of the rulers of Israel in regard

religion, I conclude that, under the provisions before referred to, it is the duty of Christian rulers to promote Christianity to the utmost of their power in the use of those means which as rulers they have within their reach.

NINTHLY. A ninth scriptural argument for the duty of rulers to provide the means of religious instruction, may be drawn from the aid given to the church at various periods with the approbation of God, *Heathen Rulers*. On the general doctrine of the concern which magistrates have with religion in their official capacity, I might refer to the case of Nebuchadnezzar, driven from his kingdom with shame, because, amidst the wisdom with which he had conducted its affairs, and the prosperity to which under his reign it had been brought, he had ascribed greatness to himself independently of God, and ruled without reference to His authority and glory. I might refer to the preservation of Nineveh through the conduct of its king, who, though neither a member of the theocracy, nor a type of Christ, thought it his dutiful to meet the accredited message of God's prophet by proclaiming a fast, and calling on his people to observe it along with him;—and to many other like instances. But it is more directly to the purpose of the argument, to request the attention of the reader to some facts recorded in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

At the beginning of Ezra, we read that God stirred up the spirit of Cyrus to issue a proclamation for the release of the Jews from captivity, and for their encouragement to return to their country, and rebuild

the temple. Among other aids and tokens of his favour, Cyrus gave them a grant of cedar trees from Lebanon for the building of the temple. No sooner had the foundation been laid, than the Samaritans began to oppose the work. The reply made to them by Zerubbabel and Joshua, is remarkable, "You have nothing to do with us, to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves will build unto the Lord God of Israel, as *king Cyrus the king of Persia hath commanded us.*"* There are some people with whom it is a mighty advantage to be able to plead another kind of authority than that of God in his word. During the reign of Ahasuerus or Cambyses, the successor of Cyrus, the Samaritans succeeded in getting authority from that prince to cause the work to cease. It ceased accordingly for about eight years; at the end of which period, in the second year of the reign of Darius, Haggai and Zechariah were commissioned of God to call on the people, with their governors civil and ecclesiastical, to arouse themselves to the completing of the unfinished temple. Among other encouragements which we find Zechariah addressing to the Jews, is the following, "This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, saying, not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts. Who art thou, O great mountain? before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain: and he shall bring forth the headstone thereof with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it."† There are few passages which our opponents more commonly employ than this, to throw

* Ezra iv. 3.

† Zech. iv. 6, 7.

empt upon the aids of secular authority in the
 of the church. The best answer that I can give
 the objection, and to the whole class of objections to
 it belongs, is the simple fact, that the prophecy
 scarcely been uttered, when a decree came forth
 Darius, narrating the original decree of Cyrus,
 proceeding as follows: "Moreover, I make a
 ee what ye shall do to the elders of these Jews,
 he building of this house of God; that of the king's
 ls, even of the tribute beyond the river, forthwith
 nces be given unto these men, that they be not
 lered. And that which they have need of, both
 ng bullocks, and rams, and lambs, for the burnt-
 rings of the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine, and
 according to the appointment of the priests which
 at Jerusalem, let it be given them day by day
 out fail: that they may offer sacrifices of sweet
 ours unto the God of heaven, and pray for the life
 e king, and of his sons."* The inspired historian
 s, "And the elders of the Jews builded, and
 prospered through the prophesying of Haggai
 prophet, and Zechariah the son of Iddo: and they
 ded, and finished it, according to the command-
 t of the God of Israel, and according to the com-
 dment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king
 'ersia.'"— "And they kept the feast of unleavened
 d seven days with joy: for the Lord had made
 n joyful, and *turned the heart of the king of Assyria*

The prayers of the godly are or ought to be the great support
 tions, and their magistrates: and if magistrates *understood* their
 interests, they would carefully secure them in their favour."—
n of Haddington.

unto them, to strengthen their hands in the work house of God, the God of Israel."* This last will easily enable us to reconcile the employment of the aid of civil rulers, with the doctrine of the "Not by might nor by power, but by my saith the Lord of Hosts." The primary cause of the whole prosperity of the church is Jehovah, if he see meet, can work without means or agents, and, if he see meet to employ them, he can employ creatures so under his control, that he can call at his pleasure to accomplish his designs. In this is the true security of the church of God,—not in the mystical, enthusiastic notions of the uselessness of external aid. But to proceed with the facts.

In the next reign, Ezra himself went up from blyon to Jerusalem. "And the king," say the sacred text, "granted him all his request, according to the hand of the Lord his God upon him." Then follows a copy of the letter of Artaxerxes: "And I, even I, Artaxerxes the king, do hereby decree to all the treasurers which are beyond the river, that whatsoever Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven, shall require, it be done speedily, unto an hundred talents of silver, &c. Whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, let it be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven; for why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons? Also we require of you, that, touching any of the priests, and Levites, singers, porters, Nethinims, or ministers of this

* Ezra vi.

God, it shall not be lawful to impose toll, tribute, custom, upon them." Having inserted the letter, Ezra exclaims in the fervour of a pious soul, ascribing his success neither to the king, nor to his own courage and prudence, but to God, "Blessed be

Lord God of our fathers, which hath put such strength as this in the king's heart, to beautify the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem; and hath extended mercy unto me before the king and his counsellors, and before all the king's mighty princes."* About twelve years after the date of this decree, begins the story recorded by Nehemiah, who having received intelligence of the desolate state of Jerusalem, while residing in the palace of Artaxerxes, presented a request before the king, that he would "send him to Judah to build the city of his fathers' sepulchres." The request having been granted, the narrative proceeds thus: "Moreover I said unto the king, If it please the king, let a letter be given me to Asaph, the keeper of the king's forest, that he may give me timber to make beams for the gates of the palace which pertained to the house, and for the wall of the city, and for the house that I shall enter into. And the king granted me, *according to the good hand of my God upon me.*"†

These facts speak too plain a language on the question before us to need any comment. I would simply ask the reader to observe in the following words of the law of Moses, in what light God regards those nations that refuse to aid the Church in her straits, as we have just seen the Persian monarchs aiding her.

* Ezra vii.

† Nehemiah ii. 7, 8.

"An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to their tenth generation shall they not enter into the congregation of the Lord for ever: *because they met you not with bread and with water in the way, when ye came forth out of Egypt*; and because they hired against thee Balaam the son of Beor, of Pethor of Mesopotamia, to curse thee."* It is very true that if a nation, being able, shall refuse to succour the church in her difficulties, God can either help her without human aid, or he can command aid to her from some other quarter: but what God can do and does, is one thing, and what men ought to do is another. "If thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time," said Mordecai to queen Esther, "then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place; but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed."

TENTHLY. Another argument for the duty in question may be drawn from the authority over Empires with which the Mediator is invested, for the good of his Church. It is not more clearly revealed, that the whole world is under the moral government of God, than that this government is subservient to the interests of the Mediator's kingdom; of whom it is declared that the Father "hath put all things under his feet, and given him to be head over all things to the Church which is his body," constituting him "the Governor among the nations," and "giving him power over all flesh, that he may give eternal life to as many as he hath given him." So soon as this authority of Christ over the nations is made known to them, they

* Deut. xxiii. 3, 4.

me bound to recognise and to fall in with it, not ing Him to make use of them as involuntary in-ments, but kissing his sceptre, and offering them- as his willing subjects to further his designs. t Christ will make use of them whether they : his authority or not, is no more an argument inst their obligation to consecrate themselves his service, than it is an argument against the gation of individuals to seek God's glory, that, ether they seek it or not, he will make all things work together for promoting it. It is enough that re is a righteous authority vested in Christ over pires for the attainment of certain ends. From this mediately arises the duty of their acknowledging authority, and actively falling in with those ends. ain, therefore, we conclude that rulers are bound to ke use of the peculiar facilities they possess for oviding the means of religious instruction.

FINALLY. In support of the scriptural duty of ers to endow the church, I have still to call the atten- n of the reader to a few miscellaneous passages of : Word of God. I begin with Isaiah xlix. 22, 23, en along with lx. 9—13, 16, 17. "Thus saith the ord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the entiles, and set up my standard to the people: and ay shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy ughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And gs shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens y nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee th their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord: they shall not be ashamed that wait for me."

“Surely the isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee. And the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee; for in my wrath I smote thee, but in my favour have I had mercy on thee. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted. The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir-tree, the pine-tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary; and I will make the place of my feet glorious. Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breasts of kings: and thou shalt know that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob. For brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver, and for wood brass, and for stones iron: I will also make thy officers peace, and thine exactors righteousness.” It must be obvious, I think, to every candid mind, that these texts naturally suggest the idea of rulers not only submitting themselves to Christ personally, but lending their aid to the church by means of the resources proper to them as rulers. Had it merely been said in a general way, that kings should yield obedience to Christ and promote his cause, the case would not have been so strong; but there is reference made again and again to extensive contribu-

ney, and the various external means which rulers to control, and which they possess abilities for providing. Thus in immediate with the words, "the nation and kingdom that serve thee shall perish," it is added, "the Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir-tree, the pine-tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary." But the case becomes stronger, when we take into view the fact, the language of these prophecies has manifest allusion to the building of the second temple, to which authority and revenues of heathen princes lent of fact eminently subservient. It is im- read the words, "the glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir-tree, and the pine-tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary," without perceiving that there is an allusion to the ornaments by the kings of Persia, some particulars of which have already been detailed: nor am I aware that there is a single commentator of any note who has said otherwise.

The force of these texts cannot be evaded by saying that they are prophetic, and that prophecy is the duty of the Christian prince. "If Christian princes," says Mr. Hallam, "in establishing Christianity, look to promote a rule, even allowing them to do what is in their own self, which we deny, they do it on wrong principles so utterly wrong, that if followed they would prove subversive of all moral law, and sanction the commission of every crime." The answer to this is abundantly simple. It were no height of absurdity to argue from the mere

fact of an event being predicted, that we ought to help it forward. But if the event be of the nature of a blessing, which God promises to confer upon the church by the voluntary instrumentality of men, (which is beyond doubt the case in this instance,) then the prophecy *does* become a rule of duty. In declaring what men shall in fact do for the good of the church, it declares what God would have them do.* The attempt of our opponents to exclude the idea of official power from these texts, and to limit their signification to kings "taking a part and an interest, heartfelt and pious, in the increase and training of the church's spiritual children,"†—this arbitrary attempt can be accounted for only by the fact, that they suppose it previously established, that there is something in the very nature of a union of Church and State irreconcilable with Christianity. Taking this for granted, they conclude that these texts must needs be interpret-

* Mr Marshall gives us another admirable specimen of logic in his remarks upon the words "kings shall be thy nursing-fathers, and their queens thy nursing-mothers." "The pronoun *their*," says he, "proves that the queens spoken of in the prophecy are not those who in legal language are termed *regnant*, but those who are termed *consorts*; in other words," (let the reader observe this, in *other words*) "that it is not in their public but in their private capacity that both the kings and the queens are mentioned." Admirable reasoning! Why, pray, must the text speak of official power exclusively, or of personal influence exclusively? Because the text predicts that queens-consort shall use their personal influence, (and their influence is frequently considerable even in national affairs, see Esther v., Nehem. ii. 6.) does it therefore follow that the text does *not* predict that kings shall use their official power? Why may not the prediction be, that the king in his station, and the queen in hers, shall do their utmost for the good of the Church?

† Wardlaw's Sermon, p. 21.

so as not to imply this union. "Is it not therefore obvious," says Dr Wardlaw, speaking of the words of Isaiah xlix. 22, 23, "that they ought to be understood in consistency with what the rest of scripture teaches respecting the nature and distinctive characters of the Church of God? If, throughout the Bible, and especially the New Testament, we find asserted and implied, the spirituality of the kingdom of the Redeemer, and its independence, alike in its exigencies and its nature, of all political association with the governments of this world,—then must the promise in question be interpreted in a sense that shall harmonize with such representations."* Now *on supposition* that Dr Wardlaw and his friends had established the anti-christian nature of a connection between the Church and the State, it were fair enough to ask us to stretch a point, to make these and similar texts harmonize with this ascertained fact. Though it would be difficult, yet we should be bound to do our utmost. Far, however, from granting that they have made this out, we hold it proved, on the contrary, that a union of Church and State in some shape is a matter of positive obligation. But without assuming so much at present, all I demand is, that we proceed to the interpretation of these texts without assuming that the scriptures prohibit Christian rulers from using their power for the promotion of Christianity. The texts will then speak for themselves, teaching in the clearest manner the duty of rulers to make use of the facilities they possess for promoting the cause of God among their subjects.

* Wardlaw's Sermon, p. 20.

The next text I shall refer to is Psalm lxxii. 10, 11. "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Seba and Sheba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him." Mr Marshall treats with his wonted contempt the use which the friends of Establishments make of this passage, on the ground that it speaks only of "offering gifts," or making presents "freely and generously," to which, says he, "who among all the opposers of Establishments ever objected?" Now if the point of this answer be, that the aid which the rulers spoken of give to the Church, they give voluntarily, it is enough to say in reply, that the aid which *our* rulers give to the Church, they give voluntarily. However Mr Marshall and his friends may be opposed to the national endowment, they will please remember that they are neither the nation, nor its rulers, and that the matter is perfectly free and voluntary, on the part of those whose office it is to represent and express the national will. If the point of Mr Marshall's answer be, that the text speaks of presents given by rulers, not from the public revenue, but from their own property, I reply to this, *first*, that from the close connection in which stand the two clauses, "all kings shall fall down before him— all nations shall serve him," it is clear that the kings are not spoken of in their personal, apart from their official capacity; and *secondly*, that the Psalm refers in the first instance, or in its language has allusion to those kings who were tributary to Solomon, and brought presents to him in token of subjection. "And Solomon reigned," says the scripture, "over all kingdoms, from the river unto the land of the Philistines, and

the borders of Egypt: they brought presents, served Solomon all the days of his life."* These presents were obviously national gifts; since they were made in token of national subjection. However, it would be by no means unworthy of the mode of reasoning current among our opponents, to allege that, if the presents spoken of were national as respects Solomon, they may be considered private and personal as respects Christ.† I have only further to repeat what was said in reference to the texts before cited, that, however our opponents may imagine; they can find a meaning for a passage like this, consistently with their views, when they proceed to its interpretation *assuming* the unlawfulness of the union Church and State, the words will easily suggest to those who do *not* take this for granted, the idea of *real* aid. A similar remark is applicable to the words of the second Psalm, "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings, be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord, &c." On this passage Dr

1 Kings iv. 21.

I might give another reply to this distinction between the private property of kings, and the public money, namely, that the stated revenues of the churches in this country are just as truly private donations as the annual bounty of His Majesty to the General Assembly, of which Mr Marshall condescends to speak with approval. They were not originally produced by taxation, but given freely and voluntarily by pious individuals: of course the lapse of time that has since intervened, has not altered their character. Whatever compulsion may be in the case, is not employed to reduce the revenues, but only to give effect to the will of the monarch, who constituted them permanent burdens upon their property. But I wish for the present to argue the whole question on the ground to which our opponents are so anxious to confine us—namely, of national taxation.

Wardlaw concludes his remarks thus:—"Jehovah, who in the beginning of the Psalm, laughs at the puny efforts of their vain and weak audacity, does not, at the close of it, bespeak the aid of their official functions, but warns them of their own danger, and admonishes them, for their own sake, to timely submission." There is a sneer here at the idea of God "bespeaking the aid of the official functions of rulers?" but God is just as independent of the aid of private individuals as of magistrates. He certainly does not bespeak the aid of their official functions, as he could not command it when he pleased, or as if the success of his cause hung upon the contingency of their giving or withholding it. But he bespeaks it as he does the aid of private individuals, in order that, by timely compliance with the command, they may not be broken with the rod of his power. The sneer presupposes the *uselessness* of the aid in question; but that is the point in dispute.*

Before proceeding to notice certain passages of the New Testament which bear on our subject, it is proper to premise something on the question, what sort of evidence in favour of our views might reasonably be

* "The force of the argument arising from these and similar promises and predictions is such, that Mr Edward Williams, though an Independent, acknowledged that they imply a national profession and establishment of Christianity. In answer to the objection, 'If the above prophecies refer to *national conversions*, do not that lead to *national churches*,' he replies, 'That a national establishment, if *well ordered*, appears more agreeable to the prophetic passages we have been considering than the Anti-pedobaptist plan; nay, more agreeable to the general tenor of Revelation.' *M' Crie's Statement.*

acted to be found there, supposing them to be in ac-
 currence with the mind of God? Our opponents insist
 we shall produce an express command in favour of
 zional endowment of the church; and they hold that
 want of this is equivalent to a prohibition. I re-
 at the reader's attention to a statement of their
 ions on this head, taken from Mr M'Gavin's *Let-*
to a Covenanter. "Christ's commission to the
 tles runs in these terms:—'ALL POWER is given
 me in heaven and in earth. Go ye *therefore* and
 b all nations, baptizing them in the name of the
 er, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teach-
 them to observe all things whatsoever I have com-
 manded you: and lo, *I am with you always, even unto*
end of the world.' Mat. xxviii. 18—20. The
 tles were about to enter on a work for which
 felt themselves to be inadequate, as certainly
 were in their own strength; but they were en-
 gaged to proceed by the assurance that all power in
 ream and earth was given to their Master, who pro-
 ved to be always with them, which, in order to serve
 purpose of encouraging them, and fortifying their
 ds, must imply that Christ's power should be with
 n, to enable them to fulfil their commission, by
 hing disciples to observe all things which he com-
 manded. Most certainly then, the civil establishment
 is religion, by any of the nations of this world,
 not one of the things which he commanded, else
 would have taught it, and his power, which in
 n was mighty to the pulling down of strongholds,
 ld have enabled them to accomplish it, and thus to
 given a divinely instituted model for the estab-

lishment of churches in after ages. That power shook the prisons in Jerusalem and Philippi, and the chains drop from the hands of the apostles, have awed all the kings of the earth, and have them submit, had the apostles required them to lish and endow Christian churches. Yet nothing the kind was done, nor *even taught*, by these doubtless taught 'all things whatsoever Christ commanded them;' from which it is evident it was the will of Christ that it should be done."

Now, in this paragraph two things are all first, that the power of Christ would certainly been at the service of the Apostles, to awe submission the kings of the earth, and bring to establish Christianity, if this measure had been accordance with the mind of Christ: and secondly since Christ enjoined the apostles to teach all that whatsoever he commanded them, they would assuredly have taught the obligation of the State to provide for the church, if this had formed a part of the will of Christ. As to the former allegation, it is plain the argument proves far too much; for doubtless it was in accordance with the mind of Christ (that his laws, for the question here respects will of command not will of counsel,) that the kings of the earth should *be converted*. Why then was not the power of Christ at the service of the apostles for the accomplishment of *this*? The same reasons that account for his power not having been exerted in this and number of other like cases, will account for the fact in the before us.

To the second allegation—that since the ap

were to teach all that Christ commanded them, they would have taught this, if it had formed part of the will of Christ—the answer is, that, in the circumstances of the primitive church, an explicit command on this point was not to be expected, and was not necessary in order to establish the duty. It will be carefully observed, that the duty of a State to endow the church is not pleaded for as being of a strictly absolute nature. It is a duty not only dependent on the previous duty of the rulers and more influential part of a country attaching themselves to the Christian cause, but liable, moreover, to various limitations and modifications, according to the circumstances of different countries.* Such being the case, it is not difficult to see excellent reasons, why the apostles should not declare in express terms the duty which was dependent, as well as liable to important modifications in its practical application, so long as the other duty, which was absolute and independent, had in no instance been complied with. Any express commands on the subject which the apostles could have given, must, so far as we can see, have been of so general and absolute a kind, as to be of comparatively little use in the way of direction, while they must have proved highly dangerous, as the church increased in numbers and influence. In all likelihood, they would have led the Christians, from a natural desire to see their Master's command carried into effect, to pursue a course of insubordination, op-

* There are various duties similarly circumstanced. A family, for instance, may be so divided within itself on religious subjects, as to render it impossible to discharge the duty of family worship.

posed not only to the spirit and prosperity of the gospel, but to the very principles on which rests the constitution of the State to endow the church, and for which an endowment is designed. On the other hand, they would doubtless have led to persecution on the part of the emperors; furnishing them a plausible ground to justify it. Let us then pause a moment, that it was the will of Christ that Christianity should so far have diffused itself as to include among its friends the most powerful persons in the empire, the emperors should then of their own accord lend their official aid to the faithful formerly persecuted; I ask whether, in the instances of the apostolic age, it was not entirely in perfect accordance with the spirit that precepts of Christianity, to lay down certain principles, out of which, taken along with those of Old Testament scripture, the duty of endowing the church would naturally be seen to arise as soon as circumstances should admit of the duty being discharged; the application of the principles to the particular case, along with all limitations and qualifications, being left to be regulated by the wisdom of divine Providence, in conjunction with Christian prudence, and a sense of duty.

We may draw an illustration from the question of slavery. There is no express prohibition of slavery in the New Testament. It is not even *in so many words* to be incompatible with the peace and full prosperity of the gospel. But we think of alleging, (certainly our opponents in this question have not been accustomed to al-

this account the gospel does not condemn slavery, or require the followers of Him who came to *em man*, to exert themselves for its abolition. It is even more difficult to account for the absence of an express prohibition on this subject, than of an express precept on the other. The abolition of slavery approaches much nearer, to say the least, to the nature of an absolute moral duty independent of circumstances, than the endowing of the church. Moreover, it requires more from their selfishness to be stimulated to the discharge of the former duty, which is for the good of *others*; whereas, their very self-love will naturally stimulate Christians, when they become the influential part of a community, to secure for themselves and their religion every advantage they fully can. It ought still farther to be borne in mind, that, while there are (as we shall just now see) several principles in the New Testament applicable to both cases, there is this most important difference in favour of the duty for which we are contending, that the first Christians had before their eyes an approved example of a national support of the church in that part of the Scriptures where alone they could expect to find it. There was no need therefore of an express precept to authorize the giving of a similar support, so soon as the circumstances of the nation should have become similar. To demand this, is absurd, and it is in direct contradiction to the reasonings which our opponents themselves employ, in the controversy with the Baptists and Anti-sabbatarians, who use the same mode of arguing to support their respective schemes. Nay, we are en-

titled to go further and say, that before the assumption arising from the Old Testament enactments and examples could be thrown off, so that the Christians should not be warranted or bound to act upon them, it was requisite that there should be an express change upon the law ; or, at all events, that the case of the Jewish church should be manifestly inapplicable to the Christian, as to the idea of reasoning from the one to the other being absurd. We have seen that not only was the supposition not absurd, but most sound, and consistent with reason and the analogy of Divine truth ; that in fact, there was no greater reason for throwing the Old Testament on this matter, because of circumstantial differences in the dispensation, than for throwing it aside in any case whatever. It is needless, however, to assume so much as this. It is enough if the application of the Old Testament in this matter be not obviously inadmissible. Even the Jews should be entitled to call for an express change in the law. As to our opponents demanding a *repeal* of the law, it is wholly out of the question.

Thus much being premised, I would now request the reader to look back for a moment to the six heads of the present argument, together with the tenth. He will find *that they consist of general principles common to the Old and New Testaments*, which, by good and necessary consequences, manifestly infer the duty of Rulers to employ the facilities they possess for providing the means of religious instruction.

There is one book, however, of the New T

it, to which, from its prophetic character, the
 sons are less applicable, that have been mentioned
 rendering it unlikely that express language should
 found in the New Testament. Accordingly it
 as so happen, that in the Apocalypse something
 re express is found than in any of the other
 ks. Passing by Rev. xi. 15, "The kingdoms
 this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord
 of his Christ," as being perhaps somewhat too
 leral in its terms, to lead to any important
 elusion without assuming some of the points
 dispute, the first text to which I would refer,
 Rev. xii. 15, 16, "And the serpent cast out of
 mouth water as a flood after the woman, that
 might cause her to be carried away of the
 d. And *the earth helped the woman* : and the
 th opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood
 ich the dragon cast out of his mouth." It is agreed
 all hands that the earth in this passage is the
 abol of the State, then standing in the Roman
 pire, while the woman is the symbol of the Church.
 re then we have an approved example of aid given
 the State to the Church,—aid too of so important
 ind, that it is described as preventing the Church
 ing a prey to the machinations of Satan. Perhaps
 case might be strengthened by taking into view
 se historical events to which the flood of water,
 d the help given by the earth to the woman, are
 lieved by the best commentators to refer. But the
 gument is independent of this.

The only other passage which I have to cite, is
 Rev. xxi. 24, "And the nations of them which are

saved shall walk in the light of it (the new Jerusalem): *and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it.*" On this passage Dr Wardlaw remarks as follows: "I can say no more, than that have tried, without success, to discern the connexion between the passage and our present subject; as that what I do not understand I am unable to confute. Those who can discover, in this figurative expression of a symbolical prophecy, the authority of civil magistrates to determine the true religion, and the legitimate forms of its service, to establish these by law and to enforce the maintenance of them by assessments and civil penalties, I must leave in the undisturbed possession of both their premises and their conclusion." No Dr Wardlaw knows quite well that we in this part of the island at least, never pretended to discover a connection between this or any other scripture, and *the principles of Erastianism*. Passing this, however, I shall state briefly wherein the connection appears to me to lie between the passage before us, and that duty of rule for which we contend. To say that the words refer to the heavenly state, and so have nothing to do with the question, is too summary. I believe them to be a figurative description of the heavenly state. But whence is the language taken, and to what does the figure refer? That the language is taken from the description of the latter-day glory in Isaiah lx. is manifest, that some eminent divines regard the similarity of description as fixing the reference of the whole scene to the millennial, and not the heavenly glory of the church. Agreeing with their premises, I cannot see the force of their conclusion. As the mill

lory of the church is a shadow of her heavenly
 o in this description of the latter by the
 the Holy Spirit takes up his own description
 former by the prophet, making only such
 and additions as to show that it is not the ter-
 glory of the church of which he is treating, but
 tial, under the figure of it. While the text,
 , is to be figuratively interpreted of the
 a heaven, it is to be *literally* understood of
 ch on earth; and thus we learn that the
 glory while here below, will, in part, consist in
 ving from the kings of the earth that service
 implied in their "bringing their glory and
 nto it." How much this service includes, I
 presume to say; but to exclude from it all
 honour and service, while the church is still in
 ion capable of receiving it, is to do palpa-
 nce to the language. It may be added,
 were inconsistent with the office of kings to
 o the church that glory which alone is peculiar
 and inconsistent with the duty of the church
 e it, it seems not a little strange that the
 pirit should pollute his descriptions of the
 state by making use of such images to sha-
 rth.

g thus brought to a close our Scriptural ar-
 for the duty of Rulers to endow the church,
 becomes necessary to notice certain passages,
 our opponents think they find a condemna-
 national endowments, and of every other
 of supporting the church but the voluntary con-
 s of the people. "We find," says Dr Hough,

“that the New Testament expressly appoints means for the support of Christianity, and amputates and enforces these means by example. That the voluntary contributions of Christians. ‘Let is taught in the word communicate to him that in all good things—if we have sown unto you things, it is a small thing that we reap your carnal—so hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel;’ these appointments are exactly in the spirit of the great maxim, ‘my kingdom is not of this world,’ are not less obvious, nor less operative than the following, ‘go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature—this do in remembrance of me.’”* Dr Heugh is not at all putting this alleged institution upon the same footing with the Lord’s supper. “It was a part of the religion,” says Mr M’Gavin, “to provide for these objects, by contributions from the members as God had prospered them. They regarded this as belonging to the fellowship of the gospel, like the Lord’s supper and other ordinances. What would you think if the civil power were to deprive Christians of the privilege of singing praise of their Saviour in their assemblies, by substituting organs at the public expense, in place of human voice? But the duty of singing to the Lord is not more clearly enjoined, than that of liberating the poor for the gospel ministry in every part of the world. Now a short and sufficient answer to all this is the simple fact, that the apostle Paul laboured in

* Glasgow Speeches, p. 12. † Letters to a Covenanter, p.

hes from which *he declined receiving anything as support*, choosing rather to labour with his hands. See 1 Cor. ix. 12., 2 Cor. xi. 7—9., 1 . ii. 9., 2 Thess. iii. 8, 9. It is very evident if the support of ministers by the contribution of those to whom they minister, be matter of *an institution*, like the preaching of the gospel, *the administration of the supper*, then Paul was *instructing* these churches from observing an ordinance *of the Lord*, depriving them of one of their privileges, *striking them off* from an essential part of the fellowship of the gospel. Aware of this difficulty, Mr *Win* endeavours to escape from it thus: "In cases *of extreme poverty*," says he, "pastors may lawfully be accepting such support, and labour with their hands as Paul did." But where is the evidence *of extreme poverty*" in the churches of Corinth and *Galatians*? Nay, we have the express and repeated *testimony* of Paul, that he declined support from these *churches*, "not because he had not the power to *do so*, (a somewhat harsh speech, to say the least, *if they were in extreme poverty*,) but in order that he might *make himself an ensample unto them*," and *he might cut off occasion* from those who sought *to pervert his ministry* by charging him with selfish worldly motives in his work. Would Paul, for *such reasons of expediency*, have hindered these *churches* from observing an express institution of *the Lord*? The idea is preposterous. I am desirous the reader's attention should be fixed upon the *reasons* that induced Paul to decline the support of *these churches*. They were reasons of pure expedi-

iciency; and if such reasons could warrant declining the contributions of those among whom he laboured, reasons of the same class warrant others to follow his example; and so the matter is taken out of the range of expostulation, and brought within that of expectation. There is unquestionably an institution of Christ in favour of the minister's *right* of maintenance among those among whom he labours, according to the means,—a right which of course implies a corresponding *obligation* upon the people. But to talk of an obligation on the part of the people to maintain their own minister is absurd. The right is wholly on the part of the minister, and therefore, if he happen to be insufficiently supported in a different manner, and so require the contributions of the people, or, if for other good reasons of expediency he do not consider it proper to demand them, no hardship is inflicted, no right of the people is violated. It is *inexpedient* to dispense with their contributions more than inexpedient it cannot be.

After all, it is manifest that this alleged institution cannot possibly apply to the case of ministers in unenlightened countries. There we cannot expect those who receive of our spiritual things, shall in return of their carnal things; but the gospel be preached to some at the expense of other things. At what point then in a church's history do contributions become one of absolute obligation from reasons of expediency? Many cases are conceivable, in which, long after the formation of a church, it would be ridiculous to act strictly

principle of the minister receiving his support from people among whom he labours. But what kind of institution is that, which thus admits of exceptions every point; and in the application of which, expediency necessarily becomes the ultimate rule of conduct? *The minister has a right of recourse upon people according to their means.* That is the sum substance of the whole law upon the subject. I add, that the principle of our opponents cuts at root of private, as well as national endowments the support of religion: we find them, indeed, admitting this, and boldly condemning all permanent endowments whatever. The leading Dissenters in England, perceiving the absurdity of this, allow that there is nothing in the institutions of Christ which demns either national or private endowments in principle of them.* But so full are their brethren on this part of the island of their favourite voluntary principle, that for the sake of it they hesitate not to demn both, as inconsistent with the institutions of Christ. "In short," says Mr M'Gavin, speaking of private endowments of the Presbyterians and Independents of England, "the system of endowing churches is not Christ's way of providing for the support of the gospel ministry, and we cannot expect his blessing upon it."†

See an article in the Eclectic Review for December last, on Church Reform.

† Letters, p. 60.—The words which immediately follow those above quoted, are well worthy of remark: "There is not so much objection to the endowment of schools and colleges. The arts of reading and writing, the science of arithmetic, languages, &c. are

Taking it then for granted, that there is in the laws of Christ which forbids the maintenance of ministers at the expense of others than the people among whom they labour, I have now to ask whether it is not at the expense of the State? We are now upon the question of expediency, be it objected that the question is, why not at the expense of the State so far as concerns the laws of Christ about the maintenance of ministers? It is mere declamation of these laws requiring that "whatever is given in support of religion, be given freely;"* for the principle of a national endowment is in perfect accordance with this. In national acts, it is not the opinions or the wishes of any class of the subjects that we have to do with, but the will of the nation constitutionally expressed. In endowing the church, the State is to be viewed simply following out the spirit of the Apostle's exhortation, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" It is to be viewed as one person, acting most freely and voluntarily, from a regard for the glory of God.

all things of this world, with the charge of which, men of this world may be safely entrusted." This extract suggests various trains of thought. I content myself with one. The reader will observe in the middle of the passage, saved Mr. Marshall the trouble of grappling with the question, whether religion is not to form part of every system of national instruction. It has even been painful to add *moral philosophy*. Does not the mind of many a youthful mind cry aloud that the right teaching of moral science, not to speak of religion, is not, and can never be, independent of the religious principles of the teacher?

* Marshall on Eccl. Estab.

authority of Christ, the diffusion of pure religion, and the best interests of civil society.

Our opponents lay it down as one of those fundamental principles which they place in opposition to national endowments, that "Christianity has within itself, in the native influence of its doctrines on the minds of those who believe them, everything which is requisite for its efficient support and indefinite extension."* And how, pray, can the native influence of Christianity be more naturally or nobly manifested, than when the legislature of a great country, under the conviction of its truth, and importance to man's well-being, set themselves to devise and execute measures for its propagation? Is there no such thing as the native influence of Christianity over the minds of legislators, that their exertions in behalf of religion must, forsooth, be placed in invidious *opposition* to the influence of the gospel on the minds of those who believe it? Here again makes its appearance that unworthy notion which we have long ago scouted, that a legislature, instead of being as it ought to be and may be, an assembly of Christians, acting under the influence of Christ's authority at their official station, must be treated as some atheistical thing, over which it would be absurd to suppose Christianity to have any influence, and whose gifts could only pollute the treasury of the Lord. But it is difficult to repress feelings of indignation, when, in connection with language like that just quoted,

* Fundamental Principles of the Edinburgh Voluntary Church Association.

provide our brethren with land sufficient for and assist them to procure comfortable accommodations." "In 1801," says Ellis, "when the Admiral arrived, Pomare was asked, when the missionaries were introduced to him, *if they were to consider the district theirs,*" and so on. These exspeak volumes. They manifest how men of piety and good sense of all Christian denominations will come out on this subject, when free from the influence of prejudice.

There is another passage on which I might be saying a word, as none of our opponents have had the courage to give it a formal place in their list of objections. But as they scruple not to take what advantage they can, in the way of indirect allusion, I will allow it to pass unnoticed. The text is Rev. x. 18, which speaks of the whore of Babylon committing spiritual fornication with the kings of the earth. In the following passage, Dr Wardlaw, in no obscure text, applies this to the union of Church and State controlled by an Ecclesiastical Establishment. "I fear," he, "we shall be much nearer the truth, if we regard the connexion subsisting in Ecclesiastical Establishments between the 'kings of the earth' and the church of God, as partaking of that spiritual adultery, which is so prominent a characteristic of the Antichristian system. In what, indeed, if not in such incongruous alliances, is the spirit of such adulterous connexion to be found?"* One would have thought that, if the Deists were thus prepared to join in the absurd declamation against

* Sermon, p. 28.

shed churches, as Babylon, and did in his heart the odious name with which Babylon is here d to be applicable to them all, he would have out more plainly, and, instead of a passing would have given to this and similar texts that ence which their fearful burden manifestly de- . By this indirect allusion, however, the passage to connect its odious associations with the very of an Establishment, while the reader has no furnished him of forming a calm judgment as to opriety of its application. Let the reader then e, that before this passage can have any bearing a subject, the connection which it holds up to s so detestable, must refer, not to any particu- m of the alliance of Church and State, but to form of it. The abomination must lie in the ruity of all connection between the kingdom of and civil governments. Now I shall suppose, sake of argument, that this connection had not emonstrated to be, in some shape, matter of posi- ity. Still, he must have a mind singularly consti- who can read the whole inspired description of ominable connection spoken of in this text, and e that the mere union of Church and State is the e of all that is there condemned. The idea is ab- and if any thing more were required to show its lity than the bare statement of it, this might be towards the end of the same chapter, where it is ted, that the kings of the earth, carrying their towards Babylon to all the length of their for- nholy attachment, shall "make her desolate and , and shall burn her with fire;" in other words,

shall, in the plenitude of their detestation and tempt, utterly destroy her. Nor are we even to imagine that this might be an unwarrantable exercise of their part; for, in the 18th chapter, the same is expressed as the righteous judgment of God. "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." But this is a termination of Established churches, not yet contemplated by our opposers, who, instead of intending their destruction, assume that they seek, and are taking the likeliest way to secure their true welfare.

Very few words will suffice in noticing another objection which is often adduced upon the other side: 'The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds.' This and similar passages our opponents accompany with triumphant appeals, about the inability of Acts of Parliament, letters of horning, courts of tiends, processes of augmentation, to convert sinners to the faith of the gospel. But can they fail to see that a minister's stipend, though raised according to the highest wishes of the friends of voluntary church government, is just as much a carnal thing, and just as unequal to the work of converting sinners, as any one of the means, by which, in the Church of Scotland, we secure the stipend? The whole affair is ludicrous in the extreme. Why, we find that very Apostle who declares that the weapons of his warfare are not carnal, is again and again laying down the right of ministers to receive of the *carnal* things of the people.

tainly he never thought of converting men by the power of these carnal things. But as little did he imagine that there was any thing incompatible with the spirituality of the gospel, in making use of carnal things to sustain the arm that had to wield the sword of the Spirit. These gentlemen, however, have attained to such a height of spirituality, that it seems they think carnal things may be dispensed with altogether; at least they speak as if they thought so. To be serious; it is evident that so long as the church of Christ is in the world, she must be in various respects connected with the things of the world. She has ministers to be supported, ordinances to be celebrated, and assemblies to be held. In order to this, she must receive pecuniary aid from some quarter. From whatever quarter it comes, it is in itself considered a carnal thing, and will never turn sinners to God; but it provides the means of preaching the gospel, and that, with God's blessing, may turn them. If it be unlawful to support religion by an Act of Parliament, it is unlawful to support it by erecting a church; for this is just as secular a thing as the other, considered apart from the spiritual benefits to which it may lead.

It is usual with our opponents to introduce further at this stage of the argument various texts demonstrative of the spirituality of Christ's kingdom. There is no need of proof in regard to this: we both admit and contend for it; but we desire to know in what respects the spirituality of the church is more opposed to a contribution for her support by the State, than to a contribution by a private individual? Do you say that the former in-

volves the use of those weapons which Christ disclaims, when he says, "If my kingdom were of this world, then should my servants fight," I say that the contribution by the private person involves the use of the same weapons, if he happen to have been forced to employ the law for the defence of his property; and the State contribution involves the use of them *only* in a similar event, when men, instigated by such appeals to their passions as you have of late been addressing to them, are led to forget every claim of justice, of public utility, and of scripture precept, and to withhold their share of the public burdens. We do not pretend to have a right, *as members of the church of Christ*, to use compulsion to make good our stipends. But if the State confer upon us certain civil privileges, we have a right, *as members of a civil kingdom*, to make these good in the ordinary way. It is not on the ground of our being ministers of Christ that we are entitled to demand, or that you are obliged to make payment; but it is on the ground of our being subjects of a civil kingdom, in whose favour certain civil rights have been legally constituted. The most ridiculous misapprehensions prevail upon this subject, as if the revenues of the ecclesiastical establishment were an exaction of *the church*, an exaction of one body of Christians upon another. But the fact beyond doubt is, that the claim is a purely civil one, although it may be loosely termed ecclesiastical, as being about an ecclesiastical matter. It is a claim of the State upon its subjects; and in that view alone are they required to make it good under the usual penalties of law.

Such is some notice of the very meagre evidence

our opponents have to set against the general principles, and particular texts, by which we have endeavoured to establish the duty of our civil rulers to endow the church. Its utter insufficiency is no more than might have been anticipated, from the principle, which, I persuade myself, was established beyond the possibility of doubt in the first chapter, that only is the union of Church and State not unconstitutional. It is impossible to be thoroughly convinced without being prepared to expect, that no hall be found in the Scripture prohibiting so an effect of that union as a provision for the maintenance of divine ordinances. It will be found, that whatever strength the reasonings of our opponents from Scripture may appear to have, they derive mainly from a supposed inconsistency in the union of Church and State in general. If this has been disproved, they become wholly inapplicable. Neither is it possible to admit contrary to the general principles which form the basis of several heads of this section, without anticipating that the Scriptures shall contain nothing contrary to a national endowment of the church. For example, if we are satisfied that true religion is essential to the welfare of a State, we shall expect as a consequence, of course, that the Scriptures shall not forbid us to use means for promoting religion. A similar remark may easily be carried through the other general principles. In short, while the texts which we derive much additional weight from being the result of fixed general principles, there is a cor-

responding presumption *against* any texts which our opponents may adduce, arising not only from the absence of general principles to form their basis, but from the general principles of the question being all the other way.

But I hasten to consider, in a new section, the next allegation of our opponents respecting national endowments, namely, that, supposing they were not unscriptural, they are *unnecessary* and *inexpedient*. To the opening observations of that section, I would particularly crave the attention of the reader.

SECTION II.

e Allegation, That a National Endowment of the Church is necessary and inexpedient; showing that, on the contrary, it is fitted to promote Religion, and the best interests of Civil Society.

was taken for granted at the outset of the preceding section, that very extensive pecuniary aid is required for the due maintenance of gospel ordinances throughout the country; and that the legislature enjoys peculiar facilities for providing this aid. It is shown, as well from the light of reason as from the Word of God, that, so far from this matter lying out of the sphere of the civil magistrate, the nature of his functions, and the relations in which he stands to his subjects and to the church, do naturally lay upon him the duty of employing the advantages he enjoys for making the provision in question. Passages also were referred to, wherein God specifically promised, that rulers under the gospel shall use their official power for the church's service, *in this particular way*, of granting her pecuniary aid. To those who have cordially acquiesced in the principles thus laid down, it will appear, I made myself, that the question of expediency, considered as a question affecting *the principle* of national establishments, is already settled: and so far as con-

cerns them, therefore, the whole argument might here be brought to a close. But there may be a class of readers who, although disposed to attach considerable weight to the foregoing arguments, have nevertheless misgivings as to their solidity, arising from a suspicion that, after all, they may be opposed by the facts of the case, and the actual working of the respective systems. For their sakes, as well as for the further elucidation of the whole subject, I am willing to enter into the question of expediency; only requesting such readers to bear in mind throughout, that, in proportion to the weight which they feel constrained to give to the principles and the texts before referred to, in the same proportion ought they to expect and require, that the proof offered against establishments on the head of inexpediency, be *clear and decisive*; considering that this is not a mere question between two methods of accomplishing an end, having neither of them any strong presumption in its favour; but that it naturally lies with the Supreme Power in the State, in consequence of its command over the public purse, to make use of the public money, as for other important purposes, so for this of religious instruction.

I. It is argued then by our opponents, in the first place, that Christianity flourished without the aid of an establishment during the first three centuries; and that it gradually declined from the period of its establishment by Constantine, and in consequence of that event. "Nothing is more certain than the fact," says Dr Wardlaw, "that in about three hundred years from the ascension of Jesus, without the aids of secular power or Church authority, the Christian religion

over a large part of Asia, Europe, Africa; and, accession of Constantine and the convening of council of Nice, it was, almost everywhere throughout these countries, in a flourishing condition: and that, in the space of another three hundred years, or a little more, the beauty of the Christian religion was greatly diminished in a large part of that extent, its glory diminished and its light almost extinguished. What can be so much owing to as to the measures which were then set on foot, and followed in succeeding ages.—When we can thus fix the turning point,—the point of terminating advancement and commencing recession;—when we can settle and define the boundary at which the flowing tide began to ebb; we are surely more than warranted in thus regarding the cause.”* To this argument I answer, that the rapid propagation of Christianity in the first ages, was intimately connected with the miraculous agency vouchsafed by God in the beginning of the Gospel, and gradually withdrawn, as it ceased to be required. In saying that miraculous agency was entirely connected with the propagation of the Gospel, I am far from insinuating that miracles will convert the soul, without the special agency of the Spirit: the Spirit operates in the use of means; and those, the Word only, but various circumstances operating in the way of preparatives for the reception of the Word. It is manifest that God would not have vouchsafed miracles at all, unless as an important instrument in his hands for the propagation of the Gospel; nor

* Sermon, pp. 41, 42.

can it for a moment be doubted, that if, by the performance of a miracle, or a reference to miracles but recently and notoriously performed, herald of the gospel obtain for his testimony an attentive and respectful hearing as Paul, for instance, obtained at Lycaonia, and as is, in fact, usual preparative to the saving reception of the truth, he possesses an advantage of a very important order over a preacher, who comes with nothing more to recommend him than the intrinsic excellence of his message. I shall afterwards have occasion to show how beautifully a well-ordered establishment comes to supply to the ministers of the gospel, who were first preachers enjoyed by different means, a weight distinct from that arising out of the character of their message, and operating in the way of securing for it an attentive and respectful hearing. The argument, however, is independent of this. It is enough to know, that the first preachers of the gospel enjoyed a certain illustrious benefit, which we do not enjoy. Reasonings, therefore, about the probability of success of the gospel, drawn from their case to ours, can amount to little more than conjecture. Neither will it do to say, that we cannot prove the continuance of miracles during the two centuries *after* the Apostolic age. Supposing we should grant (what I say the least, is unlikely, and opposed to scriptural and historical testimonies,) that miracles suddenly ceased with the life of the last Apostle, although they had not been confined to the Apostles during the first century, this concession would not materially affect the force of our argument. The flourish

ate of religion, on which the argument of our opponents rests, was less remarkable in the second century, and still less remarkable in the third: whatever peculiar success Christianity had during the Apostolic age, it could not fail to enjoy the benefit of, to a greater or less extent, in the period immediately subsequent: moreover, the miracles of the Apostolic period were comparatively recent events during the two following centuries; and would, of course, be more or less independent of those laborious proofs of their redibility, to which the church in later times has been obliged to have recourse. I would press it also upon the attention of the reader, that the very withdrawal of miraculous gifts from the church was an event of such a nature, as seemed not obscurely to intimate the duty of the church, to meet the event with the use of means, arising naturally out of that change of her condition in respect of numbers and influence, which is usually allowed to have been one of the chief reasons for the withdrawal of miraculous gifts, the church no longer standing in need of them.

Before closing this answer, I would observe, that it has been the almost universal opinion of Christians, that the opposition which the gospel had to contend with before Constantine, was such, as, if not counteracted and overruled by special divine interposition, *not limited to the conferring of miraculous gifts, nor ceasing with them*, would inevitably have crushed even the truth itself. Of this, the fate of Protestant truth under the virulence of Romish persecution, affords but too strong a presumption. Accordingly, the extraordinary providence of God, protecting the church in

the first ages, and turning engines of destruction into the means of its preservation and enlargement, has ever been acknowledged, and urged with the greatest success against infidelity. But to argue the certain prosperity of the church without the aid of civil rulers, from a state of things in which not only the prosperity, but the continued existence of the church can be ascribed to nothing else than continued divine interposition, is in the highest degree unreasonable. As we are not to court persecution for the church, that it may be seen how the church can flourish in spite of it, so neither can we count upon special interpositions, rendered necessary by our ungratefully throwing away those means, by which such interpositions become, under the divine blessing, superfluous.

2. If the church was in so flourishing a state as is represented, up to the very time of its establishment by Constantine, how came it to pass that this worst of evils, the very essence of Antichrist, was not only submitted to by the whole church without protest, but hailed by all without a single exception that has come down to us, as the greatest imaginable blessing of an external kind?

3. Constantine's establishment was not the cause of the declining state of religion in the primitive church; for the decline had begun, and was going steadily forward long before that period: and we are not concerned to deny, that a national endowment, operating upon a church already deeply corrupted, may feed its corruption and hasten on its ruin, as health, for example, though in itself a signal blessing, is often the occasion of hardening men in their sins. The manner

which our opponents speak of the establishment of christianity by Constantine, manifests an extent of prejudice on this subject truly melancholy. There is not an evil which infested the church but they seem disposed to lay it at the door of the establishment. Happily, the contradiction of some of their statements on this head to known facts, is too glaring to require exposure; and when we find Dr Wardlaw deliberately saying that the act of Constantine was the point of terminating the advancement, and commencing retrogression in the church, we only wonder at the state of mind which could have led him to hazard a statement which any scholar of Mosheim or Milner is competent to refute. That religion was in a declining state in some of the Asiatic churches even before the canon of Scripture was closed, is known to the reader of the New Testament; and that both in doctrine and practice fearful roads had been made upon primitive purity long before Constantine is notorious. What judgment is to be formed of a cause which requires such distortion of facts for its support?

4. The friends of Establishments are not responsible for the mistakes which Constantine and his followers committed, in their mode of establishing and endowing the church. Can our opponents offer anything to prove, that it was not those mistakes, but the very church establishment as such, that produced the mischief?

But Dr Wardlaw thinks that he finds the Apostles virtually asserting the evil of an establishment, in the passage about the Man of Sin. "It was by this step of Constantine," says he, "that *the way was ef-*

fectually opened for the Man of Sin and the whole anti-christian 'Mystery of iniquity.' I found this observation on the prophetic testimony of the apostle Paul illustrated and confirmed by matter of fact. In predicting his appearance and character, the Apostle say to the Thessalonians—'And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way: And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.' What was it that stood in the way?—what was the let or hindrance? We apprehend it to have been the then existing heathen government of imperial Rome." Now, it might be enough to reply to this, that, according to Dr Wardlaw's own admission, the let or hindrance in the way of antichrist was "the heathen government of imperial Rome." But the removal of this could not possibly be a bad or mischievous thing in itself, whatever evils it might be the occasion of through man's corruption. And supposing we should grant, (what can by no means be conceded,) that the let or hindrance consisted specifically in the absence of an Established church, and did not include either the heathenism of the emperors, or the persecutions that arose out of it, even this would prove nothing to the purpose. It does not follow that a thing is good because, in certain circumstances, it is a hindrance to the developement of an evil. The heathenism of the

* 2 Thess. ii. 6—8.

† Sermon, p. 40.

errors was a hindrance in the way of establishing
 christianity before the time of Constantine. I pre-
 , however, our opponents are not prepared to
 tain, that it was a bad and mischievous thing for
 emperors to cast away their idols, because this
 made way for the monstrous evil of an establish-
 . They will, no doubt, say that it ought not to
 made way for it, and would not, but for the
 option of the emperors. And we are just as
 entitled to allege, that a national establishment
 t not to have made way for the mystery of
 city, and could only have done so, in the way of
 sion, through the corruption of man perverting it.
 . A second principal head of the proof offered by
 opponents on the head of Expediency, is the *State*
religion in the United States of America. Before
 eeding to reply in detail to the argument drawn
 this source, I hold myself entitled to enter a pro-
 against the drawing of any inference unfavourable
 tablishments, from the case of America; inasmuch
 ie way in which the Americans manage these mat-
 is demonstrably contrary to *right principle*; and
 efore whatever success religion may have had
 ng them, it must have had in spite of their system,
 in consequence of it. Let us look for a moment
 heir Congress. It seems that public prayers are
 ed up in it. It follows, however, from the prin-
 s of their Union, that the prayers may legally be
 ed up by a Roman Catholic, a Socinian, a Pres-
 rian, or even a Jew, according as any particular
 y may for the time be predominant in the Assem-
 . It is said that a Roman Catholic is chaplain of

the Congress at this moment. If the report be erroneous, it could at least surprise no one if it were true. There is something radically wrong in all this. There is no principle requiring the Congress to call up prayers to God at all, the same principle would require them to pray, not according to the fancy of men, but the dictates of God's Word, which cannot sanction opposite creeds. Again, it is well known that large sums of money are regularly voted away in America for the support of Colleges where Theology is taught; while it is avowedly regarded by the legislature as a matter of indifference whether the Theology be scriptural, or subversive of scripture. The reader is already aware of the melancholy fact, that one of the most eminent and best endowed seminaries in the States is in the hands of Socinians. This is the natural and proper fruit of the principles of the American constitution, in regard to religion. I might instance further the course which these principles oblige the legislature to pursue in regard to the Sabbath,—a course, the evils of which have long been felt painfully by a large portion of the Christian public in the States, although they have failed in obtaining any remedy for them, and manifestly cannot obtain a remedy consistently with the constitution.* In a word, it were easy to show that in so far as the Americans still retain some remnants of religion in their national acts, they go in the face of their own principles. How, for example, can

* The following is from Stuart's 'Three Years in North America.'—"Colonel Johnson has lately attracted public notice,

have Chaplains in their army and navy, without sacrificing the principle of letting religion alone? How have they prayers in their Congress at all, without acknowledging for the time being the faith of some particular sect? Nay, how can they consistently acknowledge a God in any shape in their public acts? There are some who do not believe in a God, or Providence; and it is hard to see why the opinions of Deists should be more respected than those of Atheists. I have no argument with the man who shall reply to this, that Theism is less disputable than Christianity. The fact is, and it is a very pleasing one, that the Americans choose rather to be inconsistent with themselves, than openly profane: hence alone it is, that they still retain among them some most precious remains of national religion. I repeat then, that whatever success religion has had in America, it must have had in spite of the system pursued there,

that the author of the report of a committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to consider numerous petitions which they had received, praying for a legislative enactment to prevent the transportation of the mails through the United States on Sundays. These petitions chiefly proceeded from the Presbyterians, and, it is observed, seemed to have forgotten that, in the United States there is no national religion: and that the same principle, which might lead to the prohibition of the transportation of the mails on the Christian Sabbath, might also extend the prohibition to the Jewish Sabbath. The petitions were, of course, rejected by the legislature." From the report of the committee I extract the following sentence, to show the ground which the Presbyterians of America took up in this question. "The petitioners have not requested Congress to suppress Sunday mails upon the ground of political expediency, but because they violate the sanctity of the first day of the week."

not in consequence of it. The want of an Establishment is a part of the system. It has flowed from the general principles of the Union in regard to religion; and unless, therefore, we are prepared to argue from the state of religion in America in favour of the system pursued there generally, the argument drawn from it against an Establishment is good for nothing.

If I have thought it right thus at the outset to protest against the argument drawn from the case of America, it is not from any fear lest, when met, it should prove unanswerable. I reply to it then,

1. That, supposing the state of religion in America were all that our opponents allege, there are various important points of difference between the situation of America and of Britain, which render the argument drawn from the state of that country nothing better than loose conjecture. The most serious errors have been committed from overlooking the difference of the circumstances of different nations, and hastily concluding, that a system under which one country has prospered, must needs be attended with equally beneficial effects, if transferred to another. The enlightened politician will not neglect the experience of other nations; but he will beware of transferring it to his own country, without taking into consideration the circumstances and habits of the people, together with the genius of the institutions under which they have hitherto lived. As to America then, it ought to be observed, that the American republic was, from the first, made up of people from various parts of the world, and of exceedingly different sentiments and religion. In such a case, the difficulty of establish-

the church upon any other than the false principle of endowing all sects, must have been very great, if not insuperable. In this country, when the church of Scotland was first endowed, circumstances were as different as possible; and the result demonstrated that the church could be established here without hindering the efficiency of the civil government. To what extent God, in consideration of faculties like those, may have enabled the Americans to rise superior to the evils arising from the want of an Establishment, no one can tell. It is one thing for God to bless a country, doing the best it could in the circumstances in which his Providence placed it, and another thing for God to bless a country *throwing away* its opportunities. Moreover, the people of America have less difficulty than ours, in providing the support of the gospel, and Clergymen can here live on a smaller income than in this country. I need mention no other causes of this, than the vast difference in the amount of taxation, arising chiefly out of the difference in the extent of national debt; together with the condition of America, as a country presenting large tracts of uncultivated land of the best description, which can be purchased for almost nothing, and on which men can live for little. It ought to be observed again that the question before us is not merely whether our establishment be *inexpedient now*. The allegation we have to meet is, *it is inexpedient absolutely, and from its very nature*. Before, therefore, the case of America can be brought to the purpose of our opponents, they must be prepared to show from it that Scotland could

have wanted the Establishment, and would have been better without it, *from the year 1560 downwards*. To attempt, however, to argue this would be ridiculous, the difference being so wide between the circumstances of Scotland at the time of the first reformation, and those of the States, at, or any time since the Union. It must still further be kept in view, that whatever success religion has had in Scotland, it has enjoyed in connection with an establishment for 270 years. When religion shall have flourished in America without a national endowment for the half of that time, the advocates of the American plan will have some claims to be heard. The candid reader will perhaps be disposed to attach greater weight to this remark, when he shall have accompanied us in considering the actual state of things in the United States.

Hitherto we have supposed the representations which our opponents give us of the state of things in America to be substantially correct, endeavouring to point out such differences in the circumstances of the two countries, as make their conclusion against establishments unwarrantable. I have now, however, to reply to their argument from America,

2. That the state of things in America is not in accordance with the representations of our opponents, and that if the real state of that country is not such as by itself to afford an unanswerable argument in favour of establishments, it is at least not such as to afford any presumption whatever, and far less any proof, of their inexpediency. It may be right to say here once for all that I am not going to attempt to throw discredit on the religion which appears to exist in the United States.

I do honestly rejoice to believe that there is much, much genuine piety in that country; and that the finger of God may be traced more or less decidedly in American revivals of religion; especially those of New England, from the days of Edwards to this day. The admission of this does not affect our argument.

The testimony which was given by Dwight on this subject thirty years ago is now well known; but its importance is so great, that it would be improper not to give it a prominent place in the present discussion. It is the testimony of an American, attached to American institutions (as appears from his *Theology*), of high intellect, good sense, and knowledge of the world. Having mentioned that in the State of Connecticut the people were required by law to contribute to the support of religion, while in the States south of New England it was otherwise, he proceeds thus: "In the year 1800 there were in Connecticut 251,002 inhabitants, and in the States south of New England, 4,033,775. The whole amount, according to this estimate, will stand thus:

	Congregations.	Ministers.	Vacancies.	Pluralities.	Ministers not settled.	Inhabitants.
In Connecticut	209	189	20	0	5	251,002
In states S. of N. England	430	242	160	81	33	4,033,776

"In Connecticut then, a sixteenth of the number of inhabitants form 209 congregations, and support 189 ministers. Of these congregations 20 were vacant, and five of the ministers were unsettled. In the States south of New England, sixteen times the number of inhabitants formed 430 congregations, of which 81

were pluralities, and 160 were vacant. The ministers supported and settled, were 209. If these States maintained congregations, and were supplied with ministers in the same proportion as Connecticut, the whole number of congregations would be 3344, and the whole number of ministers settled and supported would be 3024. In Connecticut, every inhabitant who is not precluded by disease or inclination, may hear the gospel and celebrate the public worship of God every Sabbath-day. In the States specified it is not improbable that a number of people, several times as great as the census of Connecticut, have scarcely heard a sermon or a prayer in their lives." Afterwards, he says, "To complete the picture it is only necessary to add that the number of churches in all places where there is an establishment, keeps full pace with the population." After stating that an examination of the religious state of Massachusetts (where matters are on the same footing as in Connecticut) would have given a result not essentially different, he concludes the letter with these important observations: "In happy conformity with this estimate, and the scheme here supported, has been the prevalence of religion in these two States. It is doubted whether there is a collection of ministers in the world, whose labours have been more prosperous, or under whose preaching a greater proportion of those who have heard them have become the subjects of real piety. I know of no country in which revivals of religion have been so frequent, or in proportion to the number of inhabitants so extensive as in these States. If, at the same time, we advert to the peace, the good order, the general distribution

justice, the universal existence of schools, the universal enjoyment of the education they communicate, the extension of superior education, it will be difficult for a sober man not to perceive that the smiles of Heaven have regularly accompanied this system from its commencement to the present time. I need not, however, have gone farther for the illustration of this subject than to a comparison of the States of Rhode-Island and Connecticut. The former of these, independently of Providence, Newport, and two or three other small towns, is in all these important particulars a mere contrast to the latter. Yet these States were planted by colonies from the same nation, lie in the same climate, and are separated merely by a meridianal line. A sober man who knows them both, will hardly hesitate, whatever may have been his original opinion concerning this subject, to believe that the legislature is bound to establish the public worship of God."

On this testimony, Mr Marshall makes the following observation: "Whatever might be the opinion of Dr Dwight, or whatever the opinion of other respectable individuals in the United States some dozen or twenty years ago, with regard to the utility of legislative enactments for the support of religion, there is no such opinion now." The accuracy of this statement I should be disposed to question; but supposing it to be correct, it leaves untouched the testimony of Dwight as to the facts of the case. We have the testimony of a competent and impartial witness, to the operation of the voluntary principle, as compared with a legal provision, in America itself, up

to the year 1800. I feel no surprise, that in a country where sects are so much multiplied, and the heterodox form so large a portion of the community, good men should, in general, feel jealous of enactments for the support of religion. This not only does not affect the facts on which Dwight built his judgment, but it does not affect the accuracy of the judgment itself as to the utility of an establishment in countries, where, like our own, such practical difficulties do not exist. Neither is its importance affected by the change which has since taken place on the laws of the New England States respecting a provision for religion, and which, in all likelihood, has arisen from the increasing force of those difficulties which might be expected to attend a legal provision in a country like America. It would be going too far to hold the judgment of Dwight as a proof of the expediency of Church Establishments in general; but it is not going too far to hold, that, in the face of that judgment, and the facts on which it is built, the example of America can, with no appearance of reason, be adduced to establish their *inexpediency*.

I have now to call the attention of the reader to a testimony of so late a date as January, 1832. It is that of Mr Flint, Principal of the Seminary of Rapide, Louisiana, the author of a work entitled "Recollections of the last ten years in the valley of the Mississippi," of which some interesting notices have been given to the British public in the Quarterly Review for October last. It is a later work of the same author from which I am about to quote, entitled "The History and Geography of the Mississippi Val-

y.* To which is appended a condensed physical geography of the Atlantic United States, and the whole American Continent." In his previous work, Mr Flint had given an account of the difficulties which he himself had encountered during his residence as a minister in the Mississippi valley. "The Atlantic country," says he, "has heard much, and too much, of our unwillingness to support preachers in these regions. There may be a few exceptions that have not come to my knowledge, widely as I have travelled; but I feel too well assured, of all other representations to the contrary notwithstanding, that the people think in general, that attendance upon preaching sufficiently compensates the minister. No minister of any Protestant denomination, to my knowledge, has ever received a sufficient living two years in succession. Take these circumstances together, and you will then have some idea of a minister's prospect of worldly success and comfort." Now, I argue nothing from the mere fact of Mr Flint having himself failed in procuring a livelihood in the Mississippi valley. It is very possible that may have been his own fault; but his testimony to the state of things generally is entitled to weight, coming as it does from one who was no enemy of American institutions (as we shall soon see,) and no advocate of Establishments. It appears, indeed, that, in this very book he rather speaks against them, if we

* This valley includes Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas Territory, Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, West Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Michigan Territory, North-West Territory, Oregon Territory. Total population, 800,000.

may trust the accuracy of the Reviewer, who makes the following remark: "Any attempt to provide the means of regular religious instruction for the multitudinous population scattered over the woods and prairies of the west, would be an unwarrantable infringement of the rights of the American citizen. Even Mr Flint is too good a republican not to drop some reflection of this sort every now and then, in the midst of those miserable details which, *à priori*, one would have fancied set down on purpose to demonstrate the egregious folly and cruelty of the system of government that permits such things to be." However, I should not be disposed to attach so much weight to what is found in the *Recollections*, were it not for what appears in the other work, which is a book not about the author or his own concerns at all, but an elaborate statistical work of some 7 or 800 pages, embracing a vast variety of matter, (the notices of religion being only occasional,) and manifesting great ability, research, and patience of investigation. No man of sense would have ventured in a work of this nature, to give a representation of facts not only false, but injurious to the institutions of his country. I quote from the second edition of the work. The reading of the passage will at once dissipate all jealousy in regard to the witness.

"RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF THE WESTERN PEOPLE.
An experiment is making in this vast country, which must ultimately contain so many millions of people, on the broadest scale on which it has ever been made, whether religion, as a national distinction of character, can be maintained without any legislative aid, or even recognition by the government. If there be any re-

ance to religion, in any of the constitutions and enactments, in the western country, beyond the simple, occasional granting of a distinct incorporation, it manifests itself in a guarded jealousy of the interference of any religious feeling, or influence with the power of legislation. In most of the constitutions, ministers of the gospel are expressly interdicted from any office of profit or trust, in the gift of the people. In none of the enactments are there any provisions for the support of any form of worship whatever. But if it be inferred from this, that religion occupies little or no place in the thoughts of the people, that there are no forms of worship, and few ministers of the gospel, the inference can be wider from the fact. It is the settled political maxim of the West, that religion is a concern entirely between the conscience and God, and ought to be left solely to his guardianship and care. The people are generally averse to binding themselves by any previous legal obligation to a pastor for services stipulated to be performed. It is the general impression, that he ought to derive his support from voluntary contributions, after services performed, and not influenced by any antecedent contract or understanding. There are many towns and villages where these modes prevail; but such is the general standing policy of the West.

“Hence, except among the Catholics, there are very few settled pastors, in the sense in which that phrase is understood in New England and the Atlantic cities.*

* As there is now no legal provision for the gospel even in the New England States, the contrast which Mr Flint here states be-

Most of the ministers, that are in some sense permanent, discharge pastoral duties not only in their individual societies, but in a wide district about them. The range of duties, the emolument, the estimation, and in fact the whole condition of a western pastor, are widely different from an Atlantic minister. In each case, there are peculiar immunities, pleasures, and inconveniences, growing out of the differences of condition. We do not undertake to balance the advantages in favour of either. It has been a hundred times represented, and in every form of intelligence, in the eastern religious publications, that there were few preachers in the country, and that whole wide districts had no religious instruction, or forms of worship whatever.*

tween the eastern and western states, in connection with the experiment, "whether religion, as a national distinction of character, can be maintained without any legislative aid," must refer, I presume, to the abiding effects of the provision which there once was in New England, as rendering it impossible to infer from the case of that part of the country, that "religion, as a national distinction of character, can be maintained without any legislative aid."

* That the state of things in this immense country is thus represented by the Orthodox men in New England, we shall by and by see abundant evidence; and we shall farther see how the representation is to be reconciled with the statement of Mr Flint which immediately follows, that "there are as many preachers in proportion to the people, in the Western as in the Atlantic country." The truth is, that what Mr Flint, who is not very strict in his views, is pleased to account a minister of the gospel, the Orthodox Presbyterians of Massachusetts and Connecticut reckon unworthy of being so regarded. But of this more afterwards. One of the principal sources of fallacy in the representations of our opponents in regard to American provision for the gospel, is just this very confounding of men of all sects and descriptions, calling themselves ministers, and holding them all forth as regular pastors.

we believe, from a survey, certainly very general, that we trust, faithful, that there are as many preachers, in proportion to the people, as there are in the Atlantic country. A circulating phalanx of Methodists, Baptists* and Cumberland Presbyterians,† of Atlantic missionaries, and of young élèves of the Catholic theological seminaries, from the redundant mass of unoccupied ministers, both in the Protestant and Catholic countries, pervades this great valley with numerous detachments, from Pittsburgh, the mountains, the lakes, and the Missouri, to the gulf of Mexico. They all pursue the interests of their several denominations in their own way, and generally in profound peace.

"It is true, a serious mind cannot fail to observe with regret, the want of the permanent and regular moral influence of settled religious institutions. The regular 'church-going bell,' to our ear, such a delightful peal on the sabbath, is not often heard in the western villages with the recurrence of that day; and there is something of tranquil sobriety, of elevated and just notions of morals, the influence of which is so immediately received in a country, where regular worship prevails, that in the more unsettled districts of this country, is felt as a painful privation; but if we except Arkansas and Louisiana, there is every where else an abundance of some kind of preaching. The villages on all sides contain printed notices, and written

* A large portion of the Baptists in America is Unitarian.

† This large sect is Semi-Pelagian.—See Dr Miller's letter in regard on Revivals.

ones are affixed to the public places, notifying what are called 'meetings.' A traveller in a clerical dress does not fail to be asked, at the public houses, where he stops, if he is a preacher, and if he wishes to notify a meeting.

"There are stationary preachers in the towns, particularly in Ohio. But in the rural congregations through the western country beyond Ohio, it is seldom that a minister is stationary for more than two months. A ministry of a year in one place may be considered beyond the common duration. Nine tenths of the religious instruction of the country is given by people who itinerate, and who are, with very few exceptions, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, men of great zeal and sanctity. These earnest men, who have little to expect from pecuniary support, and less from the prescribed reverence and influence, which can only appertain to a stated ministry, find, at once, that every thing depends upon the cultivation of popular talents. Zeal for the great cause, mixed, perhaps, imperceptibly, with a spice of earthly ambition, and the latent emulation and pride of our natures, and other motives, which unconsciously influence, more or less, the most sincere and the most disinterested, the desire of distinction among their cotemporaries and their brethren, and a reaching struggle for the fascination of popularity, goad them on to study all the means and arts of winning the people."*

Thus have we the testimony of a competent, and

* Flint's History and Geography of the Mississippi Valley. 2d edition, pp. 141—146.

ridently impartial witness, first of all to the *fact* of the want of a regular and stated ministry in those vast regions. We are assured, no doubt, that there is "an abundance of *some kind* of preaching, if we *except* Arkansas and Louisiana." But we are also assured, that a ministry of a year in one place may be considered beyond the common duration;" that "nine tenths of the religious instruction of the country is given by people who itinerate;" that "these earnest men have little to expect from pecuniary support, and less from the prescribed reverence and influence which can only appertain to a stated ministry;" and that "it is the general impression, that the pastor ought to derive his support from voluntary contributions, after services performed, and uninfluenced by any antecedent contact or understanding." Then we have the testimony of the same witness to the effects of this state of things, as visible in "*the want of the permanent and regular moral influence*," produced by settled religious instruction, of that "tranquil sobriety," and these "elevated and just notions of morals, the influence of which," says he, "is so immediately perceived in a country where regular worship prevails." Mr Flint, indeed, goes on to speak of a certain substitute for a stated dispensation of ordinances, which these people enjoy in what are called "camp meetings," occasional assemblages of vast numbers of people for worship in the open fields. These he speaks of as having done incalculable good, and produced a manifest change in the habits and manners of the people. Where are few, it is presumed, in this country, who will be disposed to regard such meetings as a very

desirable substitute for a regular gospel ministry; and indeed, we find the warmest friends of revivals among the enlightened Presbyterians of New England expressing their disapprobation of them, and their conviction, that they ought to be resorted to only in cases of decided necessity. Speaking of camp meetings, Dr. Miller of Princeton, in his admirable letter to Dr. Sprague, dated March, 1832, says, "I confess I deeply regret that the use of camp meetings should be resumed in our body."—"To say nothing of the irregularities and abuses which it is difficult, if not impossible, in ordinary cases, wholly to avoid, on the skirts, and sometimes in the interior, of such camps, they have always appeared to me adapted to make religion more an affair of display, of impulse, of noise, and of animal sympathy, than of the understanding, the conscience, and the heart. In short, they have always struck me as adapted, in their ordinary form, to produce effects on our intellectual and moral nature analogous to those of strong drink on the animal economy; that is, to excite, to warm, and to appear to strengthen for a time, but only to pave the way for a morbid expenditure of 'sensorial power'—as we say concerning the animal economy—and for consequent debility and disease."* Such is the miserable substitute enjoyed by the inhabitants of the immense valley of the Mississippi, for a stated gospel ministry in general wanting among them.

It will now surprise the reader but little to find that, in the more enlightened portions of the States,

* Sprague on Revivals of Religion, p. 320.

in the atmosphere of Princeton and Andover,—the whole tract of the Western country is regarded by Christian men as a moral wilderness. Indeed it scarcely requires proof, that the condition of the western States is regarded in the most unfavourable light by the religious part of the eastern, since there can be no reason to doubt the correctness of Mr Flint's statement, that "it had been a hundred times represented, and in every form of intelligence, in the eastern religious publications, that there were few preachers in the country, and that whole wide districts had no religious instruction or forms of worship whatever." It may be right, however, to confirm the statement, by laying before the reader one or two brief extracts from these eastern religious publications. The following, from the *Missionary Tour of the Rev. Messrs Mills and Smith*, has been repeatedly laid before the British public:—"Our exertions have been stimulated by a deep conviction of the deplorable state of that country. Never will the impression be erased from our hearts, that has been made by beholding those scenes of wide spreading desolation. The whole country, from Lake Erie to the Gulf of Mexico, is as the valley of the shadow of death. Darkness rests upon it. Only here and there a few rays of gospel light pierce through the awful gloom. This vast country contains more than a million of inhabitants. Their number is every year increased by a mighty flood of emigration. Soon they will be as the sands on the sea-shore for multitude. Yet there are at present only a little more than one hundred Presbyterian or Congregational Ministers in it. Were these ministers equally distributed through-

out the country, there would be only one to 10,000. But now there are districts of country, containing from 20 to 50,000 inhabitants, entirely destitute. And how shall they hear without a preacher?

"From the estimates made in the preceding part it appears that 76,000 *families* are destitute of the sacred volume, in this portion of our country. These estimates are not ungrounded and exaggerated conjectures. They are the result of much inquiry, and patient examination." No doubt this tour was formed nearly twenty years ago. It is not, however, very likely that a system which had previously done so little for the country, should have produced so very material improvement within the last twenty years, especially considering that the population in that period increased from one to four millions. The operation of the voluntary scheme must have altered marvellously indeed, if the provision for religious instruction bear a larger proportion to the population now than it did at the period to which the above tract refers. But we are not left to conjecture this matter. "In surveying the destitute settlements," says the Narrative of the Presbyterian Church in America, dated 1827, "which are without the ministrations of the gospel, the remote northern part of the State of New York, the States of Ohio, Indiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri, Georgia, and Kentucky, present themselves in mournful array before us. For although in all these there are some regular, fa-

* In 1800, it was something short of 800,000. In 1810, it was short of a million. The present population may be rated at 4,000,000. Flint, p. 130.

ful ministers of Christ, there is an immense territory lying waste, without labourers to cultivate it. *Now and then a travelling missionary scatters the seed of the Kingdom. But having none to succeed him, the fruit of his toil is blasted for want of efficient cultivation.* Of this we have painful evidence in the fact, that, within the limits of a single presbytery in the synod of Indiana, *five churches* have become extinct during the last year, from this cause. The present destitute condition of those extensive western regions, and the rapidly increasing population, which far surpasses the increase of ministers, furnish pressing motives to exertion on the part of the churches."*

"In all the States west of the Alleghany mountains," says the American Tract Society, "together with Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, occupying more than half the territory of all the States in the Union; embracing, in 1810, more than 1,000,000 of inhabitants; in 1820, 2,200,000, and now not very far from 4,000,000—into all those States, tracts only to the value of 7000 dollars have yet been sent, since the formation of the Society, which is but little more than one-half the amount circulated by the ladies of New York and Brooklyn, or by the Tract Society in the single village of Utica; yet a large portion of that population have not the Bible, nor any places of public worship, nor any stated preaching of the Gospel, and

* For this and several other valuable extracts from the reports of American societies, I am indebted to the Second Defence of Church Establishments, by a Churchman, whose truly admirable publications on this subject entitle him to a place among the ablest controversialists.

are in a great measure destitute of the other means."^{*} "The Quarterly Journal of Education" says Mr Flint, vol. ii. p. 210, "thus assigns the posed number of those attached in any way to Christian society,—the total number of worshippers in the western country, 2,730,000, and of those who do not worship, 1,300,000. This estimate is too small. The number of people in the western country who have their religion yet to choose, exceeds 2,000,000. Mr Marshall endeavours to escape the force of statements like these, by assigning various causes to account for the inadequacy of the means of religious instruction in America, particularly the very rapid increase of population, and the tide of emigration that is constantly flowing towards America, from all quarters of the globe. Now this would be a very good answer to an argument having for its object to abuse the character of the American people. But far from invalidating, it confirms our argument, the object of which is nothing more than to show an universal deficiency in the means of religious instruction. Whatever be the causes of the enormous excess of population beyond the means of instruction, the fact remains unaltered; and the more fixed the causes are, so much the less prospect is there of a time arriving when the Establishment shall be superfluous.

The facts hitherto adduced have related to the numerous States included in the Mississippi Valley. Those to which I would now crave attention, re-

^{*} Vide Missionary Herald of America, 1827.

either to some of the eastern States, or to the condition of the country in general.

In the account of the Massachusetts Society for promoting Christian knowledge, published at Andover in 1815, we find the following statement regarding Rhode Island, which the reader will remember was particularized by Dwight, as affording, in his days, an illustration of the evils arising from the want of an Establishment. It is divided only by a meridional line from those New England States which formerly had the benefit of an Establishment, and where religion still chiefly flourishes, partly, I doubt not, through the abiding influence of a state of things now passed away. It was, moreover, colonized from the very same countries with those States. "It is to be regretted," says the Society, speaking of this State, "that but few of the instructors are duly qualified for their employment; that in most of the schools no religious nor moral instruction is given; that the voice of prayer is never heard, nor the Bible read in them. So great indeed is the fear of the catechism in most towns, that in many schools even the commandments are not permitted to be taught. In the few schools in which this kind of instruction was given, order, proficiency, and good manners were uniformly the most conspicuous. 'Among all the families,' says one of the Missionaries, 'on which I called, (more than five hundred,) I found but two in which I had reason to believe that family prayer was at any time practised.' The same deplorable neglect was constantly lamented, wherever they visited, even among professors.

"Excepting the town of Providence, there is not in the three Missionary counties, (Providence, Kent, and Washington,) which, in 1810, contained 55,565 souls, *i. e.* nearly three-fourths of the population of the State, one Congregational or Presbyterian church. The inhabitants of Rhode Island, who profess to believe Christianity, are divided into Baptists, Quakers, Episcopalians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Christyans,* or Smithites. The Baptists, the most numerous denomination, are subdivided into Calvinistic, Arminian, Separate, and Seventh Day Baptists. The inhabitants also of each town (parishes are not known in that State,) are divided, though not equally, into these several denominations. Hence the indisposition and inability to support regular well-informed public teachers of religion. Hence the general prevalence of ignorance, bigotry, enthusiasm, and fanaticism, together with their legitimate progeny, scepticism, and infidelity. Hence also the common profanation of the Sabbath, and the low state of morals in that region. In many places the preachers hold but one meeting on the Sabbath, and that in the afternoon. Indeed the sentiment is common and openly inculcated by the Baptist preachers, that 'no time is holy but that which is spent in the house and worship of God.' This general aversion to public worship experienced by our Missionaries, is owing, in part, to the very strong prejudices excited in the mass of the people by their illiterate preachers, who are constant and vehement in their invectives against learned

* These are Socinians.

relings, *i. e.* Congregational Ministers. Another use that has contributed not a little to produce this difference in persons of more education and thought, furnished by the *manner* in which public worship is generally conducted in that region, and by the ignorance, enthusiasm, and eccentricities, not to say vices, of many of their preachers; among them it does not appear that there is more than one of college education.

“ Of twenty-seven Baptist, Methodist, and Smithite teachers, with whom our Missionaries became acquainted in the region, and most of whom they heard teach, there are but few, according to the journals, whose characters and sentiments are such (even if they possessed the requisite talents, natural and acquired) to recommend religion to men of discernment and integrity. Of one it is noted, ‘he is a man whose character is not nearly spotless, but he does not want words; and this is the chief talent of many preachers, and often renders them popular, though the words convey no idea.’ In one town there was no minister, except a negro, who could not read a word when he began to preach, and often boasted, ‘I did not know 3 from a bull’s foot,’ proving by this, to the satisfaction of many, his call from heaven; and nothing could unlearn them but the vileness of his conduct. The character of Baptist preachers in general, as stated in the journals, is, that they are enthusiastic Socinians, profoundly ignorant, and very noisy; that the object of their sermons is, ‘to rouse the imagination and heat the passions, without communicating any light to the understanding, or conviction to the conscience.’

With this view, 'they use the most dolorous tones and thundering vociferation, in which they pour forth a stream of unconnected vehement nonsense.'—'All the preaching and exhortation I have heard,' says one Missionary, 'has been calculated to excite laughter or tears.' Ignorance, enthusiasm, dogmas, and practices such as have been stated, defy all comment. Their genuine offspring among the lower classes of society, are errors of every name, bigotry, fanaticism, hatred of the truth, and a train of low vices; and among the higher ranks, contempt of the clergy, disgust at the name of religion, sheer infidelity, and downright atheism."

In the same account we have the following observations on the state of New Hampshire, which is one of those New England States that formerly enjoyed the benefit of an Establishment. "A few years since, in New Hampshire, the towns of Newington, Greenland, Stratham, Newmarket, and Durham, had all settled Congregational Ministers. Now they are in a destitute and broken state. There yet remain a considerable number who are disposed to maintain religious order, and a few friends to evangelical truth, who are furnishing for the sincere milk of the Word. But a small proportion of the people are disposed to raise money to support pious, regular, and well-instructed preachers.

"Without descending to particulars, it may be stated generally, that in the counties of Rockingham and Strafford, containing (exclusively of *Portsmouth* and *Exeter*) 76 towns, and according to the census in 1810, 83,047 inhabitants, there are 45 towns, which, with their inhabitants, 40,286 souls, are destitute of

ated means of grace. Of these 45 towns, some been destitute ten, some twenty, some thirty, some years, and in some the gospel ministry has never statedly enjoyed. One lamentable consequence is that in some towns a Christian church has not yet formed; and in some towns where churches exist the Lord's supper has not for ten, twenty, or years been once administered. Most of these churches are also much reduced in number; one from two members to two females; several to but one member; and in one town, containing 1063 the visible church of Christ, after a stated ministry of twenty-eight years, has been many years total-ly extinct.

Put up,' says a Missionary, 'near the place of meeting, in a family, whose religious divisions form a picture of the place; the man a confirmed Unitarian, his wife a member of a Congregational church, a daughter a Methodist, two daughters-in-law members of Elias Smith, a son without any profession. Ask what is the number, education, and moral character of the sectarian preachers in this region? There are about thirty ordained and licensed preachers in this vicinity, and about sixty who preach and minister in their public assemblies. Among the whole there is much more than a common school education; many with difficulty read a psalm or hymn, and cannot read so as to convey the sense. Most of the Unitarian Baptist preachers are of good moral character, but some are not. All the others are Anabaptists, and shape their course accordingly.'" the valuable publication of a Churchman, from

which these last extracts are taken, I am indebted also for the following important facts, contained in the third report of the American Society for educating pious youths for the ministry,—a report coming down to September, 1818. The statements of this institution are entitled to special regard, on account of the intimate connection of its object with the matter before us. “In 1753,” says this society, “there was in New England, on an average, one liberally educated minister to every 628 souls. When we say, then, that there should be, in the United States, one minister to 1000 souls, we only claim that the country should be supplied a little more than half as well as New England was actually supplied within the memory of many now upon the stage.

“The United States contain about 9,000,000 inhabitants. At the rate of one minister to 1000 souls this population requires 9000 ministers. Let us now see what is the actual number.

“To avoid misapprehension, the directors wish two things to be kept in mind. One is, that while the college catalogues are taken as the only basis of accurate calculation, the estimate of *competent* ministers includes, as will be seen, a large number, not educated at colleges, who are supposed to have acquired, in some other way, sufficient learning to be safe interpreters of the Bible. The other is, that this estimate has no respect whatever to difference of religious denomination.” Before proceeding with the extract, let the reader fix his mind down upon the last sentence stating that the estimate about to be made of *competent* ministers, refers simply to competency in point

d has no respect to difference of denomination even from this estimate a large number will have to be deducted, as belonging to sects whose preachers cannot be classed as instructors. But I proceed with the examination the triennial catalogues of the following, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, Middlebury, Williams, Bowdoin, Colby, South Carolina, Transylvania, and Maryland, it appears that only 1,465 settled alumni of these colleges are now alive.

1465 ministers educated in the above-mentioned colleges, probably there may be as many uneducated and infirm, as ought to be reckoned as educated in foreign countries, and now living in this country. But to make a liberal allowance for the loss, some of whom are highly respectable, 100 may be added, making a total of 1600 educated ministers.

As to the number of ministers who have not the advantages of collegial instruction, they may yet be considered as competently educated, but no means of exact information. Probably, the pious and intelligent of every denomination will be satisfied, that it would be a large number to consider them one-half as numerous as have been publicly educated; that is, to place them at 800. But place the estimate at 900; the whole number of competent religious ministers in the United States of all denominations, is 1700, and the deficiency 6500. This is a general view which has now been given of

this subject, is strongly confirmed by the following statements respecting particular districts of our own country.

"In North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia containing, according to the last census, a population of 1,223,048, there are but 110 competent ministers leaving 1,113,048, destitute of proper religious instruction. A respectable gentleman, who is a native citizen of South Carolina, informs us, that in an ancient district of the state, embracing an extent of 900 square miles contiguous to the sea coast, there is but one place of worship, and that not used; and not one Christian church or minister of any denomination."

The report goes on to instance several other States. I content myself with another extract.

"If we come to New England, where Christian privileges are enjoyed in a higher degree than in any other region of the country, there is much to excite the solicitude of good men. The population of New England is about 1,500,000. The number of ministers qualified to preach the gospel, among *all denominations*, cannot be estimated at more than 1000 leaving a deficiency of 500.

"In the two oldest counties of New Hampshire which contain 77 towns, there were, in 1813, (and the case cannot be essentially altered still,) 45 towns destitute. In 24 of these towns, containing 20,000 inhabitants there were but 161 church members; and in nine of the 24 towns there was not one; seven had always been destitute of preaching, One church had had no communion for five years;—another none for two years. Two churches had become extinct, and

which formerly contained forty members, retained but two, and these females.

is a gloomy picture, but there is one view in still more gloomy. If the people of the United are now in this condition, what is to become of erity? When we call to mind, that, seventy, New England was supplied with one col- educated minister for every 628 souls, and, in the United States, there is not one such to 6000 souls; when we remember that this degeneracy has been regular in its progress; great causes which produced it are every coming more powerful and extensive in their s; and when we add to all this, that the ss of the community are not awake to the -with what apprehensions must we look to- generations that are to come.

ments, founded upon our college catalogues, at, in respect to the number of our educated, we are far behind our fathers! But when the result of these statements forward, and the effect of continued degeneracy upon fu- s, an awful prospect opens before us. From catalogues it appears, that for a hundred years settlement of this country, viz. from 1620 to ore than half of all the graduates of our col- e ministers. During the next period of 50 at is, from 1720 to 1770, only one out of aged in the ministry; and during the period years next following, that is, from 1770 to ly one out of five engaged in the ministry. 1800 to 1810; only one out of six. Let it

here be observed, that the number of graduates has not increased so fast in proportion as the population of the country, so that the decrease of collegially educated ministers, compared with the population of the United States, has been even greater than in the proportion of the numbers one-half, one-third, one-fifth."

"From these statements taken together, the following conclusions seem to be established :

"1. That to furnish an adequate supply for the United States, would require more than 11,000 well qualified ministers.

"2. That we actually have less than one-fourth part of this supply.

"3. That the ratio of supply has, for a long time, been regularly and rapidly on the decline.

"4. That the number of pious young men, who are able to defray the expense of their own education for the ministry, is not sufficient to provide a remedy for this alarming state of things. Whether this fact can be explained or not, it is in vain to doubt it."

"The following," says the American Home Missionary Society, in 1827, "is an authentic statement of the vacancies in regular churches, and does not include that part of our population estimated to be nearly *one-half*, which is not collected into churches and congregations. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States, numbers nearly 2000 regular churches, and about 800 of these are destitute of settled pastors; the Reformed Dutch Synod embraces 181 churches, 53 of which are vacant; the Baptists have more than 1000 destitute

; the Congregationalists, a great number, and Catholics more than 100." "But leaving out of relation; these and all other destitute churches, are hungering for the bread of life; besides it much less than *half* the population of these States, is, at this day, to an alarming degree, *of the regular administration of gospel ordinances this destitution is increasing with every wave of civilization that beats back the western wilderness. dangers alike the political security and the spiritual of millions that shall come after us.*"

These statements had been penned in order to illustrate the evils arising from the want of an Establishment, it is hard to see how they could have been, or more pointed, although they were in fact by Americans themselves, and with intentions foreign to this subject. I have now to lay before you a statement from America, dated within the last few months, of unquestionable authority, and which fully confirms all the preceding statements. In the report of the American Tract Society, there is the following passage: "The following statements furnish some data by which to estimate the magnitude of the work to be performed:—The year 1820 extended within a small fraction, over 3,000 square miles. If from this, we deduct 60,000, leaving large portions of the country where the privilege of the gospel are most richly enjoyed, we have 2,940,000 square miles of inhabited territory, embracing nine millions of our population, in half of whom, it is estimated by those best

*argued with the subject, are unsupplied with evangelical preaching.”**

Such being the actual state of religious provision in America, nothing can be more ridiculous than terms of enthusiastic admiration in which that country is perpetually spoken of by our opponents. They tell us of “America, with its 9000 ministers of religion, entirely supported by the voluntary contribution of the people,—and liberally paid;” they bid us look at the 10,000 clergymen, the free choice of the people living in the hearts, and supported by the free offerings of their respective flocks.”† Intelligible Americans, however they may feel as to the practicability of an Establishment in their own country, will look on statements like these with contempt. It is true that Mr Flint states the number of “settled ministers” at 10,000. But according to his own statements, given above, there are, in the Western States, very few settled ministers, in the sense in which the term is understood in the eastern, that is, in any proper sense of the term. And if, from the 10,000, deduct the itinerant, the illiterate, the half-starved, the heretical (which last, in America, form no contemptible portion of the whole body,) we shall find matters to be in a very different state from what Wilks and his friends would lead us to believe.

Before drawing the subject of America to a close, there are some general observations upon the foregoing facts, to which I would request the attention of

* See the *Scottish Missionary Register* for April.

† Speech of John Wilks, Esq., quoted by Mr Marshall, as given by his authorities.

r. One prominent fact to which the extracts witness, is the almost incredible *multiplication of* in America. This is a very great evil, whether regard it in its own nature, in its causes, or in its quences. It is an evil in its own nature. Though e sects into which professing Christians in Ame- are divided, were in the main orthodox, it were om a lovely sight to see so many separate inter- among the followers of the Lamb; but when we der what a frightful proportion of them take their from the soul destroying doctrines which they agate, their vast number and continued increase, ad of being made a theme of congratulation, must atter of the deepest regret to every right thinking . Many, I believe, deceive themselves when they of great multitudes in America ranging themselves r the denomination of the disciples of Christ, and or less zealous for the interests of the body to a they belong, as if all this indicated the extensive dence of a truly serious and religious spirit. But hment to, and even zeal in behalf of antichristian ines is no evidence of this, but, on the contrary, t such a vent for the natural pride and irreligion e heart, as suggests itself to those whose con- ce will not allow them to cast off the form of ness. . The evil of the multiplication of sects will er appear, if viewed in connection with its *imme- causes*. These manifestly are, a want of fixedness igious belief, and a volatile spirit in matters of re- n; than which there can hardly be a worse feature e Christian profession, either of a community or a individual. But the evil of a multiplicity of sects

is chiefly to be seen in its consequences. I suppose operation easily traced, it perpetuates increases that very unsteadiness in religious belief of which it springs: nor can any end to this be till all the sound, steady faith of the community be worn away in the indefinite subdivision of parties. It is further the means of keeping alive spreading errors which otherwise might be crushed out of themselves, or at least be so kept down as to comparatively harmless. Many errors have all perished in this country as soon as they were brot which, from being adopted in America as the cre a sect, have grown into strength, and lived to sp their ruinous effects far and wide. But above a multiplicity of sects tends to sink the dignit the Christian ministry, and to reduce the means o support. This may easily be made obvious to reflecting mind. Compare, for example, two pari with a population of a thousand souls each,—the divided into ten religious denominations with t respective pastors, the other united under one mini It is manifest that, other things being equal, ministers in the one parish will each enjoy but a s share of the influence and respectability, as they can receive but a small part of the support, which fall the lot of the minister of the other parish, who, b alone in the spiritual oversight of the people, thereby be able to acquire a standing among thei their father, friend and guide, which, in the other c will in vain be looked for. This is so well illustr in the foregoing extracts, that I cannot avoid remi ing the reader of an inference drawn by one of

American societies from the fact, that, in Rhode Island, the inhabitants who profess Christianity are divided into Baptists, Quakers, Episcopalians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Christ-yans or Smithites, while the Baptists, the most numerous denomination, are subdivided into Calvinists, Arminians, Separates, and Seventh-day Baptists. "HENCE," say they, "the *INDISPOSITION and INABILITY to support regular well-informed public teachers of religion.*"

Now, it is to the want of an Establishment that this fearful evil, of the multiplicity of sects, is beyond doubt, mainly owing. Of this it might be deemed sufficient proof, that, in America, the only great Christian country destitute of an Establishment, there are at least ten times the number of sects that are to be found in any other part of Christendom. But it is evident besides from the nature of the thing. A civil establishment of the church gives to its clergy, its doctrines, and its government, all the fixedness which the sanction of the laws of a country can give them. This of itself is a check of incalculable force upon the spirit of change and of separation; and supposing the religion so established to be sound and scriptural, (which in our case is not denied,) its value must evidently be very great. So obvious, indeed, is the tendency of the voluntary principle as a substitute for establishments to produce endless divisions, that we find it admitted in quarters where the admission is proof. "Religion," says Mr Flint, in his View of the United States, "is left to the voluntary choice of the people, no sect being favoured by the laws beyond another, it being an essential principle in the national and State governments,

that legislation may of right interfere in the concerns of public worship only so far, as to protect every individual in the unmolested exercise of that of his choice. *HENCE all the sects of Christianity are abundantly represented in this country.*"* This is introduced in connection with short statistical notices of the population, schools, religion, military force, revenue and constitution of the States, with no view to any opinions on this subject, and still less with the view of furnishing the advocates of establishments with arguments against the voluntary principle. It is of course the more valuable. To the establishment of the church, this country is mainly indebted, for its comparative freedom from that unfixed, restless and volatile spirit in religion, which is the immediate cause of the multiplication of sects. If some errors here die a natural death, if others are crushed, and if others still are kept down and rendered comparatively harmless, it is to the Establishment of the Church that we mainly owe it. That the clergy are so highly respected and so well provided for, is to be ascribed chiefly to the same cause: and that the dissenting ministers themselves have a people to work upon, whose religious principles are generally sound and steady, who have little disposition to separation and sect-making, and so are better able, as well as more inclined to support them, is mainly owing to that establishment, which it is their continual labour and ardent desire to overthrow.

But there is another fact of much importance testi-

* Vol. II. p. 9.

led to in the extracts, to which I would for a moment have attention. It is generally taken for granted that, if establishments were to perish, the clergy would at least cease to be regarded as a set of "*learned hirelings*." But this senseless cry, it seems, is as loud where the curse of an Establishment is unknown, as in our own country. The only difference is, that with us the cry is ostensibly directed against Establishments by Dissenters; while in America it is directed against the well educated and regular ministers of the Congregational and Presbyterian denominations, and proceeds from those illiterate, upstart preachers with whom that country swarms. "In many places," says one of the Societies, "the preachers hold but one meeting on the Sabbath, and that in the afternoon. Indeed the sentiment is common and openly inculcated by the Baptist preachers, that 'no time is holy but that which is spent in the house and worship of God.' This general aversion to public worship experienced by our missionaries, is owing, in part, to the very strong prejudices excited in the mass of the people *by their illiterate preachers, who are constant and vehement in their invectives against learned hirelings, i. e. Congregational ministers.*" Who can fail to suspect from this, that the whole of this affair is very much a *conflict between whatever is settled and unsettled* in the religious condition of a people?—that the antipathy at bottom is not so much to the *Establishment* of the Church, as to that *fixedness* which it is the grand object, as it is the invariable effect of an establishment to give to the visible church; so that after the establishment is removed, we have but to wait till the institution and

this subject, is strongly confirmed by the following statements respecting particular districts of our country.

“In North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia containing, according to the last census, a population of 1,223,048, there are but 110 competent ministers leaving 1,113,048, destitute of proper religious instruction. A respectable gentleman, who is a native citizen of South Carolina, informs us, that in an ancient city of the state, embracing an extent of 900 square miles contiguous to the sea coast, there is but one place of worship, and that not used; and not one Christian church or minister of any denomination.”

The report goes on to instance several other instances. I content myself with another extract.

“If we come to New England, where Christian privileges are enjoyed in a higher degree than in any other region of the country, there is much to be solicited of good men. The population of New England is about 1,500,000. The number of ministers qualified to preach the gospel, among the *nominations*, cannot be estimated at more than leaving a deficiency of 500.

“In the two oldest counties of New Hampshire which contain 77 towns, there were, in 1813, (a case cannot be essentially altered still,) 45 towns destitute. In 24 of these towns, containing 20,000 inhabitants there were but 161 church members; and in the 24 towns there was not one; seven had been destitute of preaching. One church had no communion for five years;—another none for ten years. Two churches had become extinct, and

another, which formerly contained forty members, there remained but two, and these females.

“ This is a gloomy picture, but there is one view in which it is still more gloomy. If the people of the United States are now in this condition, what is to become of their posterity? When we call to mind, that, seventy years ago, New England was supplied with one collegially educated minister for every 628 souls, and that now, in the United States, there is not one such minister to 6000 souls; when we remember that this rapid degeneracy has been regular in its progress; that the great causes which produced it are every year becoming more powerful and extensive in their operations; and when we add to all this, that the great mass of the community are not awake to the danger;—with what apprehensions must we look toward the generations that are to come.

“ Statements, founded upon our college catalogues, prove, that, in respect to the number of our educated ministers, we are far behind our fathers! But when we carry the result of these statements forward, and calculate the effect of continued degeneracy upon future times, an awful prospect opens before us. From these catalogues it appears, that for a hundred years after the settlement of this country, viz. from 1620 to 1720, more than half of all the graduates of our colleges were ministers. During the next period of 50 years, that is, from 1720 to 1770, only one out of three engaged in the ministry; and during the period of forty years next following, that is, from 1770 to 1810, only one out of five engaged in the ministry. From 1800 to 1810, only one out of six. Let it

here be observed, that the number of graduates not increased so fast in proportion as the population of the country, so that the decrease of collegially educated ministers, compared with the population of United States, has been even greater than in proportion of the numbers one-half, one-third, or fifth."

"From these statements taken together, the following conclusions seem to be established :

"1. That to furnish an adequate supply for United States, would require more than 11,000 qualified ministers.

"2. That we actually have less than one-fourth of this supply.

"3. That the ratio of supply has, for a long time been regularly and rapidly on the decline.

"4. That the number of pious young men, who are able to defray the expense of their own education for the ministry, is not sufficient to provide a remedy for this alarming state of things. Whether this fact can be explained or not, it is in vain to doubt it."

"The following," says the American Home Missionary Society, in 1827, "is an authentic statement of the vacancies in regular churches, and does not include that part of our population estimated to be nearly *one-half*, which is not collected into churches and congregations. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States, numbers nearly 2000 regular churches, and about 800 of these are destitute of settled pastors; the Reformed Dutch Synod embraces 181 churches, 53 of which vacant; the Baptists have more than 1000 destitute

churches; the Congregationalists, a great number, and the Episcopalians more than 100." "But leaving out of the calculation, these and all other destitute churches, which are hungering for the bread of life; besides these, not much less than *half* the population of these United States, is, at this day, to an alarming degree, destitute of the regular administration of gospel ordinances; *and this destitution is increasing with every wave of emigration that beats back the western wilderness. It endangers alike the political security and the spiritual salvation of millions that shall come after us.*"

If these statements had been penned in order to illustrate the evils arising from the want of an Establishment, it is hard to see how they could have been stronger, or more pointed, although they were in fact written by Americans themselves, and with intentions totally foreign to this subject. I have now to lay before the reader a statement from America, dated within the last twelve months, of unquestionable authority, and which amply confirms all the preceding statements. In the last report of the American Tract Society, there occurs the following passage: "The following statement may furnish some data by which to estimate the real magnitude of the work to be performed:—The census of 1820 extended within a small fraction, over 600,000 square miles. If from this, we deduct 60,000, embracing portions of the country where the privileges of the gospel are most richly enjoyed, we have remaining, 540,000 square miles of inhabited territory, probably embracing nine millions of our population, *more than half of whom, it is estimated by those best*

*acquainted with the subject, are unsupplied with states evangelical preaching.**

Such being the actual state of religious provision in America, nothing can be more ridiculous than the terms of enthusiastic admiration in which that country is perpetually spoken of by our opponents. They tell us of "America, with its 9000 ministers of religion, entirely supported by the voluntary contributions of the people,—and liberally paid;" they bid us look "at the 10,000 clergymen, the free choice of the people, living in the hearts, and supported by the free-will offerings of their respective flocks."† Intelligent Americans, however they may feel as to the practicability of an Establishment in their own country, will look on statements like these with contempt. It is true that Mr Flint states the number of "settled ministers" at 10,000. But according to his own statements, given above, there are, in the Western States, very few settled ministers, in the sense in which the term is understood in the eastern, that is, in any proper sense of the term. And if, from the 10,000, we deduct the itinerant, the illiterate, the half-starved, and the heretical, (which last, in America, form no contemptible portion of the whole body,) we shall find matters to be in a very different state from what Mr Wilks and his friends would lead us to believe.

Before drawing the subject of America to a close, there are some general observations upon the foregoing facts, to which I would request the attention of the

* See the Scottish Missionary Register for April.

† Speech of John Wilks, Esq., quoted by Mr Marshall, as one of his authorities.

One prominent fact to which the extracts witness, is the almost incredible *multiplication* of in America. This is a very great evil, whether regard it in its own nature, in its causes, or in its quences. It is an evil in its own nature. Though e sects into which professing Christians in Ame-re divided, were in the main orthodox, it were om a lovely sight to see so many separate inter- among the followers of the Lamb; but when we der what a frightful proportion of them take their from the soul destroying doctrines which they agate, their vast number and continued increase, id of being made a theme of congratulation, must atter of the deepest regret to every right thinking . Many, I believe, deceive themselves when they of great multitudes in America ranging themselves r the denomination of the disciples of Christ, and or less zealous for the interests of the body to 1 they belong, as if all this indicated the extensive dence of a truly serious and religious spirit. But hment to, and even zeal in behalf of antichristian ines is no evidence of this, but, on the contrary, it such a vent for the natural pride and irreligion e heart, as suggests itself to those whose conce will not allow them to cast off the form of ness. . The evil of the multiplication of sects will er appear, if viewed in connection with its *immediate causes*. These manifestly are, a want of fixedness igious belief, and a volatile spirit in matters of re- n; than which there can hardly be a worse feature e Christian profession, either of a community or a individual. But the evil of a multiplicity of sects

is chiefly to be seen in its *consequences*. By reciprocal operation easily traced, it perpetuates and increases that very unsteadiness in religious belief on of which it springs ; nor can any end to this be seen till all the sound, steady faith of the community be frittered away in the indefinite subdivision of particular beliefs. It is further the means of keeping alive and spreading errors which otherwise might be crushed, or die of themselves, or at least be so kept down as to be comparatively harmless. Many errors have all but perished in this country as soon as they were broached which, from being adopted in America as the creed of a sect, have grown into strength, and lived to spread their ruinous effects far and wide. But above all a multiplicity of sects tends to sink the dignity of the Christian ministry, and to reduce the means of its support. This may easily be made obvious to any reflecting mind. Compare, for example, two parishes with a population of a thousand souls each,—the one divided into ten religious denominations with their respective pastors, the other united under one minister. It is manifest that, other things being equal, the ministers in the one parish will each enjoy but a small share of the influence and respectability, as they can also receive but a small part of the support, which falls to the lot of the minister of the other parish, who, being alone in the spiritual oversight of the people, will thereby be able to acquire a standing among them as their father, friend and guide, which, in the other case will in vain be looked for. This is so well illustrated in the foregoing extracts, that I cannot avoid reminding the reader of an inference drawn by one of the

American societies from the fact, that, in Rhode Island, the inhabitants who profess Christianity are divided into Baptists, Quakers, Episcopalians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Christ-yans or Smithites, while the Baptists, the most numerous denomination, are subdivided into Calvinists, Arminians, Separates, and Seventh-day Baptists. "HENCE," say they, "the *INDISPOSITION and INABILITY to support regular well-informed public teachers of religion.*"

Now, it is to the want of an Establishment that this fearful evil, of the multiplicity of sects, is beyond doubt, mainly owing. Of this it might be deemed sufficient proof, that, in America, the only great Christian country destitute of an Establishment, there are at least ten times the number of sects that are to be found in any other part of Christendom. But it is evident besides from the nature of the thing. A civil establishment of the church gives to its clergy, its doctrines, and its government, all the fixedness which the sanction of the laws of a country can give them. This of itself is a check of incalculable force upon the spirit of change and of separation; and supposing the religion so established to be sound and scriptural, (which in our case is not denied,) its value must evidently be very great. So obvious, indeed, is the tendency of the voluntary principle as a substitute for establishments to produce endless divisions, that we find it admitted in quarters where the admission is proof. "Religion," says Mr Flint, in his View of the United States, "is left to the voluntary choice of the people, no sect being favoured by the laws beyond another, it being an essential principle in the national and State governments,

that legislation may of right interfere in the concern of public worship only so far, as to protect every individual in the unmolested exercise of that of his choice. *HENCE all the sects of Christianity are abundantly represented in this country.*"* This is introduced in connection with short statistical notices of the population, schools, religion, military force, revenue and constitution of the States, with no view to any opinions on this subject, and still less with the view of furnishing the advocates of establishments with arguments against the voluntary principle. It is of course the more valuable. To the establishment of the church, this country is mainly indebted, for its comparative freedom from that unfixed, restless and volatile spirit in religion, which is the immediate cause of the multiplication of sects. If some errors here die a natural death, if others are crushed, and if others still are kept down and rendered comparatively harmless, it is to the Establishment of the Church that we mainly owe it. That the clergy are so highly respected and so well provided for, is to be ascribed chiefly to the same cause: and that the dissenting ministers themselves have a people to work upon, whose religious principles are generally sound and steady, who have little disposition to separation and sect-making, and so are better able, as well as more inclined to support them, is mainly owing to that establishment, which it is their continual labour and ardent desire to overthrow.

But there is another fact of much importance testi-

* Vol. II. p. 9.

the extracts, to which I would for a moment mention. It is generally taken for granted that if Establishments were to perish, the clergy would cease to be regarded as a set of "*learned*"

But this senseless cry, it seems, is as loud as the curse of an Establishment is unknown, as in this country. The only difference is, that with us it is ostensibly directed against Establishments and their ministers; while in America it is directed against uneducated and regular ministers of the Congregational and Presbyterian denominations, and proceeds against the illiterate, upstart preachers with whom that warms. "In many places," says one of the

"the preachers hold but one meeting on the Sabbath and that in the afternoon. Indeed the sentiment is so common and openly inculcated by the Baptist, that 'no time is holy but that which is spent in the use and worship of God.' This general averred public worship experienced by our missionaries, in part, to the very strong prejudices of the mass of the people *by their illiterate who are constant and vehement in their invective against learned hirelings, i. e. Congregational*"

Who can fail to suspect from this, that the cause of this affair is very much a conflict between whatever is settled and unsettled in the religious opinions of a people?—that the antipathy at bottom is much to the *Establishment* of the Church, as to the *needfulness* which it is the grand object, as it is the desirable effect of an establishment to give to the church; so that after the establishment is destroyed we have but to wait till the institution and

operations of the church have assumed something of regularity and fixedness, to hear the very same invectives directed against *order* in an unendowed church? If it should be said that Dissenters in this country are a very different class of men from the ignorant declaimers against the regular clergy in America, and that, in their opposition to establishments, they cannot justly be charged with the unsettled principles and selfish motives of those men: I reply that, in respect of settled principles,—before we can concede to them the superiority which they claim, they must allow us to subtract all those fixed ecclesiastical principles, habits, and feelings, which our Dissenters owe to their having sprung from the bosom, and having all along enjoyed the juxta-position of an establishment; and that, as respects motives, it may be safely left to their own speeches and writings to determine, whether dislike at the manifest superiority which the establishment confers upon its clergy, be not among the springs of their opposition to the Established Church.

Desirous as I have been to keep close to the state of religious provision in America, and to avoid all general charges against the character of the people, no notice has hitherto been taken of a fact which it would be inexcusable to pass by altogether, as it very deeply affects the question, of the extent to which Christianity exerts a practical influence over the American people in general. Of a population of nearly 13,000,000, a sixth part are slaves. It is notorious also, that the slavery of the American republic is of the worst description; penal laws being enacted in some of the States, with the express view of pre-

venting the negroes from ever rising to the rank of civilized men.

III. It is alleged still farther by our opponents, that the tendency of Church Establishments, as exhibited in their effects, is "to secularise religion, promote hypocrisy, perpetuate error, produce infidelity,—and destroy the peace and order of civil society."* Taking up the last of these charges first, as it will require little more than a single observation, I have to meet it with a direct denial. It has no foundation whatever in the history of establishments; if we except perhaps the case of Ireland, the anomalous situation of which, not to speak of defects in the constitution and administration of the Irish Establishment, sufficiently account for the heart-burnings which have been there created. *It is a Roman Catholic country, forming an integral part of a great Protestant empire.* While the latter fact accounts for, and justifies the existence of a Protestant Establishment there, the former accounts for the peculiar difficulties which that establishment has had to encounter from the first. As to the next charge—that of producing infidelity—I prefer considering it under the head of secularity and hypocrisy, with which it is inseparably connected. The charge of *perpetuating error*, may be dismissed in little more than a sentence. Whatever tends to perpetuate truth, will of course tend to perpetuate error, if *applied* to

* *Fundamental Principles of the Edinburgh Voluntary Church Association.* I have omitted the words "to destroy the unity and purity of the church," because the matter of *unity* has already been considered, and that of *purity* comes under the charge of *secularity* and *hypocrisy*.

error. The educating of children, the principles of habit and imitation, decision of character, and a thousand other things of undeniable excellence and utility, are all open to the charge of perpetuating error, and that to the same extent, and on the very same ground as the civil establishment of the church. It were easy to hold up this charge to merited ridicule ; but I hasten to take up the next charge against establishments, which calls for a somewhat fuller notice.

It is alleged to be the tendency of establishments "to promote hypocrisy." I begin the consideration of this charge by at once admitting, that in every country where an establishment has existed, our own among the rest, it has been the occasion of much hypocrisy. It is sincerely to be wished, that all the honest friends of establishments, instead of denying this, may open their eyes fully and fearlessly upon the fact, and thus be led to exert themselves to meet so serious an evil with the most suitable remedies. But unless establishments can be proved on other grounds to be unnecessary, or bad in principle, what can this admission avail to the purpose of our opponents? Why, all human laws for the prevention of crime are the occasion of hypocrisy to an incalculable extent. Thousands of rogues are daily led to act the hypocrite by laws against theft, forgery and murder. And this too is the natural and necessary consequence of such laws, *human nature being what it is*. Will it follow from this that all criminal law is mischievous, and ought to be abolished? It is manifest that the tendency of all authority together, whether of God or of man, of man in the State or man in the Church, is to produce hypocrisy

among those who are not prepared from the heart to bow to it. Is it, therefore, a mischievous thing? And must the voluntary principle be carried the length of leaving every man to follow, unrestrained, his own inclinations? The bringing up of children in the fear of the Lord, the approving and rewarding of the good, the encouraging of faithful, and the dismissing of faithless servants,—all this, through human corruption, cannot fail to produce, and does produce a great deal of hypocrisy. Is it all bad, therefore, together? And must the principle of “no favour” be carried out to its results, not only in the church, but in families, in the counting house, and in the most responsible offices of the State? Surely hypocrisy is not less detestable here than in the church. Are the Dissenters of Scotland prepared already to part with the Confession of Faith, and to throw contempt on the whole Work, as they have already done upon certain parts of it? If not, what means this noise about the tendency of establishments to promote hypocrisy? They cannot fail to see that, through human corruption, Confessions of Faith are the occasion of a great deal of hypocrisy;—and so, in a word, with all restraints whatever, both in Church and State.

The only remaining charge against establishments which merits a distinct notice is, that they tend “to secularise religion.” Making a similar concession here,—that wherever an establishment has existed, it has been the occasion of much secularising of religion,—I have yet to ask a similar question, What will the concession avail to the purpose of our opponents, unless they

can prove establishments on other grounds to be unnecessary, or bad in principle? Why, all mingling with the world on the part of the Christian tends, through his corruption, to secularise his religion. It is not, however, on that account a mischievous thing to mix with society; neither may we attempt to escape secularity, by adopting the monastic life. The whole business of the admission of church members, cannot fail to occasion much secularity in the church, so long as human nature is what it is, and the church's office-bearers have not the prerogative of seeing the heart. Must the community, therefore, like the individual, wrap itself up in a cloak of imagined purity, and, shutting its doors even against credible professors, assume a standard of discipline unknown to the Apostles, and higher than even the most rigid Independents will pretend to observe? In a word, temporal prosperity of every kind, peace, security, wealth, rank, influence, human learning,—these blessings, whether enjoyed through means of an establishment or in any other way, have ever been the occasion of much secularising both of individuals, and of the church at large. Must we, therefore, adopt the extravagances of certain sectarians that have always been found in the church, and cast away from us all temporal advantages, under pretence of keeping ourselves more pure? A man might with almost as much reason, commit suicide, in order to avoid the commission of sin. But there is no end to the absurdities involved in the inference, that establishments are mischievous, because of the secularity which, in the present imperfect state, cannot fail to be occasioned, to a greater or less extent, by the advan-

tages of a temporal kind which they confer upon the church.

I have now, however, to go a step higher, and to affirm that, if we look at *the principle* on which it is, that Church Establishments give occasion, through the corruption of man, to hypocrisy and secularity, we shall find it to be a principle in its nature most legitimate, and which, while it accidentally gives rise to much evil through man's depravity, is highly beneficial in its native and proper tendencies, as, in its actual working, it is productive of many advantages. To come at this principle, I must request the reader's attention in the first place, to one or two remarks of a general nature. As there are various circumstances, besides the mere consideration of the intrinsic worth of things, by which men are powerfully influenced in connection with their opinions and conduct, so it can admit of no reasonable doubt, that this fact is in full accordance with the design of the Creator, and with the original constitution of our nature. What is apt to make us jealous of all adventitious influence in religion is, that, in our present condition, it is so often brought to bear in support of falsehood, and that, along with influence of a legitimate kind, much that is of a nature essentially evil is often mixed up. The simple fact, however, of the mind being gradually developed through means of the instructions of those whom children instinctively reverence, is enough to put an end to all doubt, as to the propriety of bringing other influences to bear upon the mind, besides the mere presentation of the grounds on which depend the real merits of things. The principles of habit, of

imitation of those around us, especially parents, teachers, and the influential in society,—these and like principles belong to the very constitution of the mind. They cannot fail in the present condition of the world to be exceedingly abused ; but they are in themselves good, and inseparably connected with the social nature of man. Those only can deny this, who are foolish enough to believe, overlooking the most obvious facts, that the proper condition of the mind is that of an entire absence of all prepossessions, even in favour of truth and virtue, until the faculties have become matured, and the mind has acquired a capacity of balancing all the reasons of things. Whatever theories, indeed, speculative men may adopt on this subject, adventitious influences are in point of fact operating continually for good or evil. Children are acquiring their character more from these than from any thing else. Rank, learning, wealth, official station, laws, customs, public opinion—all are exerting a mighty influence perpetually over the sentiments, feelings, and conduct of the mass of society ; and, if not engaged on the side of truth and righteousness, they will inevitably be engaged on the side of iniquity.

No right thinking man will deem it enough to say, that the gospel has no need of influences like these, and that, when sent home to the heart by the Holy Spirit, it can overcome the force of them all. Doubtless it can ; and in many cases God has made his Word to break through the strongest opposing forces. But what God can do, and for special reasons sometimes does, is one thing, and what God ordinarily does, and

spected by us to do, is another. It requires but acquaintance with the history of the propagation of the gospel to be satisfied, that in point of fact it ordinarily makes little real progress, unless aided by the influences in question operating upon the truth. Witness the most wise and zealous missionaries, making frequent reference in their journals to the obstacles put in the way of their labours by the various circumstances, and praying that God, by the hearts of the more influential persons among the heathen, would thus open up the way for a more ready reception of the gospel. Nor is there any inconsistency in this, or at all inconsistent with the admitted truth and excellence of Christianity. It amounts simply to this, that God, in his providence, does not act in the face of circumstances, but makes circumstances bend to the accomplishment of his designs,—that he does not proceed in opposition to that constitution of the mind which is the workmanship of God, and of which it is one promise, that laws, official station, national habits, &c. exercise a powerful influence over the conduct, and usually brings all these influences to bear in support of his own Word. It is a very serious misapprehension of the doctrines of grace, to imagine that there is a separation of the department of grace from the department of nature, and that the work of the Spirit is in a sense sovereign, as to be unconnected with the natural workings of the mind. This is rank error, and would put an end at once to all confidence in the use of suitable means. The truth plainly

is, that while God is not tied down to a conformity with natural principles, he ordinarily works in accordance with them, even in the department of grace.

These things being premised, I observe that a Civil Establishment of Christianity (besides the more direct benefits which it confers in the way of providing the means of religious instruction), engages in behalf of the gospel some of the most powerful of those adventitious influences to which I have referred. This fact, together with its practical bearings, will require some brief illustration. In the meantime let it be held as established that, according to the constitution of the mind, these influences are perfectly legitimate ; that the engaging of them in behalf of truth is a thing most excellent in itself ; that truth can have no such intrinsic power as to be independent of principles belonging to the original constitution of the mind ; that more especially in the present state of the world, it were absurd to imagine that truth will necessarily prevail as much in spite of adverse influences, as in the absence of them ; and finally that, if the influences in question are not engaged on the side of truth, they will beyond doubt be engaged on the side of falsehood and sin. It is obvious, then, that whatever influence is exercised over public feeling and action by laws, and by the judgment and the countenance of persons occupying commanding official stations, is, by a national Establishment of the Church, brought to bear in support of the institutions of Christianity ; which are thus enabled to command a public veneration, to which they are of course most fully entitled from their intrinsic excellence, but which that excellence

none will not secure for them in a world like this. There was a certain respect which the gospel commanded in the hands of the Apostles, prior to any perception of its true excellence on the part of their hearers, through means of the miracles with which they were enabled to accompany their message. They did not imagine that they could convert men by the mere force of miracles; but as a preparative, as a removing of obstructions, and an opening up of access to the ears of men, they found miracles of vast importance. In a somewhat similar light do we regard that public respect, which the national countenance implied in an establishment commands for the institutions of Christianity.

This public respectability will, in the first place, draw multitudes within the sphere of the means of grace, who, but for the national countenance given to religion, would shamelessly turn their backs upon them. It is nothing to the purpose to say that this is not the motive from which we ought to attend on divine ordinances. The great majority of those *who ultimately come to the saving knowledge of the gospel*, are at first led to attend upon its ministrations, not so much from a conviction of its true excellence, as from some foreign influence. Being thus, however, brought within the hearing of the Word, they are made the subjects of that change of heart of which the Word is the grand instrument. But it is perhaps on the youth of a country, that the influence of that public respect of which I speak, is especially to be seen. To what is not generally and publicly respected, scarcely one in a thousand of them will pay any atten-

tion. They judge and act as they see others around them, especially the influential, judging and acting. If the ordinances of the gospel can be in some manner identified with those public things which they easily learn to reverence, the youth will thus be led to cherish a reverence for these ordinances, and to give such an attendance on them, as, by God's blessing, may issue in something better. Otherwise, the great mass of them will be likely to grow up in a state of indifference, and contempt for every thing sacred: and ministers of the gospel, to get from them even an attentive hearing, will require to go through a process hardly less laborious than is required in a heathen country.

But again; that public respect which an establishment commands for the institutions of Christianity, confers upon the ministers of the gospel illustrious advantages for the effective discharge of their office. It is true that, were the world what it ought to be, the excellency of their message would give to faithful ministers all the respectability which they need. But then, were the world what it ought to be, their message would be superfluous; and it must be evident to every sober man, that, in the absence of miraculous interposition commanding reverence, it is most desirable, that the people among whom we labour be pre-disposed in some other way to respect our official character. With those among them who already have learned to regard the ministry on account of its glorious Author, and to "esteem us for our work's sake," this will be of less consequence. But with the vast majority its importance will be great. That

tendency of an establishment to command respect for the ministerial character, and that be its uniform effect, unless counteracted by faithfulness on the part of the Clergy, may not be resumed from the nature of the case, but is proved by experience.

the proper place to take notice of some important advantages for the effective discharge of their work, which a national establishment in the clergy, and which are not so much that public respect of which we have been as causes, tending to increase it, and in that as other ways, to impart additional weight to the claims of the gospel. We have already seen, considering the case of America, that the effect of a plurality of sects in a country, is not only to diminish the provision for the clergy, but to lower their influence and respectability. It has also been proved that a civil establishment of the church tends to check the spirit of sectarianism, and to increase the uniformity of opinion and piety in religious belief. Thus, of course, to raise the ministerial character and office. It is manifest farther that the minister of an established Church has advantages for labouring in that part of the world which may be termed the heathen part of it, which no other can possess. There are many millions of people of whom it would be folly to suppose that they should require no other introduction to the Christian religion than the mention of his office, and the body of Christians to which he belongs. It is difficult to conceive any introduction more likely, or better entitled to secure

respect with these who are not prepared to enter into claims of a spiritual nature, than an appointment which has the force of a national recommendation,—a recommendation coming from that legislature which has the best possible right to see to it, that the whole people of the country be instructed in the principles of religion.

Again, the effect of an establishment invariably is, to confirm the minds of the people in the truth, not only of Christianity in general, but of its fundamental doctrines as contained in the national symbols of faith. I know that some will be disposed to sneer at this sort of conviction, and to regard it as anything but desirable. That it will not of itself save the soul is very plain ; but I say that, viewed as a *preparative for better things*, it is not in kind different from that conviction, which it is one of the grand effects, as it is among the chief designs of the education of youth to produce, and that it can be objected to only on grounds which would put an end to all instruction of the young together. It is obvious, for example, that the objection often urged against it by our opponents—that it will be equally available for the support of false religions—is either good for nothing, or cuts at the root of all instruction of the young together. But this by the way. The obvious effect of that confirmation in the truth of which I speak, is *to save the time and labour which otherwise would have to be expended in preparatory matter, and to enable the minister at once to make his appeal to the conscience and the heart*. The Apostles did not labour among the heathen, without a similar

advantage obtained in another way. When, on the day of Pentecost, the apostle Peter rose to address the assembled multitude, he did not require to occupy days on a laborious proof that Jesus was the Messiah, but found that matter done to his hand, by means of the miracle wrought in their presence: he proceeds, therefore, at once to make his appeal to the conscience of his hearers, with all boldness and authority, as knowing that they could not fail to be sensible of its justice. So in many other instances. Let the difficulties with which missionaries have to contend in heathen countries for years together, ere they have opened up the way for such an appeal to the heart, as shall even condemn the unbeliever in his own conscience,—let these bear witness to the practical importance of that sort of conviction of which I speak.

But there is yet another class of advantages conferred on the ministry through an establishment, which is deserving of special consideration. I refer to the *moral effects* of a sufficient and secure provision for the maintenance of the clergy. It is very true that, through corruption in the church, this may sometimes operate to her injury. But the proper cause of the injury is the corruption. The sufficient and well-secured provision is but the occasion of which the corruption takes advantage. Let the cause, not the occasion, be blamed; and to the cause, not the occasion, let the remedy be applied. This difficulty being out of the way, I would call the attention of the reader to some observations on the moral effects of a national provision for the clergy, contained in one of Dr Isaac Barrow's sermons, and which are at

once so much to the purpose, and so much after best manner of that eloquent divine, that no apology will be needed for the length of the extract. I to the occasional use of the words, *priest*, and *priesthood* for what we in Scotland would term minister, or ministry, will not incapacitate any reader for giving the passage a candid perusal.

“The good of the church requires, that the priesthood be well protected, well provided for, and well regarded. That men be converted from iniquity induced to the sincere practice of virtue, is the chief good of the church, that to which the favour of God is annexed, and on which the salvation of souls depends. And this good mainly depends, partly on the due execution of the priestly office, partly on the disposition of the people to comply therewith: and both those effects the comfortable estate of the priesthood is conducive and requisite. The priest must be capable to instruct with advantage, and the people disposed to learn with readiness: he must lead, and they follow cheerfully in the paths of righteousness. Which alacrity how can he be master of, whose miseries, care and grief, the inseparable companions of a needy estate, do continually distract and discompose? whose spirit is dejected with constant regret and frequent disappointments? Can he be free and expedite in the discharge of his duty, who is perplexed with the difficulties, and incumbered with the varieties of secular business, such as the exigences of a narrow condition do necessarily induce? No: few there be, that, with Epictetus, can philosophate in slavery; or, li-

Isaiah, can draw water all the day, and study most of the night.

"The priests are bound, (for the propagation of truth and right, and for the reclaiming of men from error and sin, that is, for the most important good of the church,) as the Apostles are often related to have one, *παρρησιάζεσθαι*, 'to speak all out,' (or to use an unlimited liberty of speech;) to exhort to the practice of virtue, as our Saviour did, *μετ' ἐξουσίας*, 'with licence and authority;' to deter from vice, as St Paul enjoins Titus, *μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς*, 'with an all-commanding and imperious strain;' and, (as those faithful brethren did, encouraged by St Paul's example,) *τολμεῖν ἀφοβῶς λαλεῖν καὶ λογεῖν*, 'to dare undauntedly to utter the word' of truth: they are obliged to deal impartially with all, to censure no man; to admonish, yea, and (with prudence, and seasonably) to reprove the greatest of men: not to respect the persons of the rich, nor to dread the faces of the most terrible among men. And how shall this necessary courage be engendered, be cherished, be preserved, in the breast of him who grovels on the ground, and crouches under the depressing loads of want and disgrace?

"But admit it possible, a man may be both extremely indigent and sufficiently resolute: (that is, strong without food, and fat by digesting the thin air :) with what regard then shall his free and faithful advice be entertained? Shall not his moderate confidence be accounted impudence; his open sincerity of speech be styled unmannerly presumption; his reminding others of their duty adjudged a forgetfulness of his own condition, or a disorderly transgressing the

due limits thereof: if he be not ashamed of the truth, will not the truth be ashamed of him? Shall he not prejudice more by the meanness of his garb, than further by the force of his reason, that good cause which he maintains? Will men respect his words, whose person they despise? Will they be willingly counselled or patiently reproved by him, whom they esteem, yea whom they plainly see, so much their inferior?—And Solomon himself notes the same: ‘The poor man’s wisdom is despised, and his words are not heard.’—If the preacher’s condition be not, as well as his pulpit, somewhat elevated above the lowest station, few will hear him, fewer mind his words, very few obey him. —

“We see therefore how Almighty God, that he might conciliate credit unto, and infuse a persuasive energy into the words of his prophets and apostles, was pleased to dignify them with extraordinary gifts of foretelling future events and doing miraculous works: their doctrine, it seems, (though of itself most reasonable and plausible,) being not sufficient to convince the hearers, without some remarkable excellency in the teachers, challenging the people’s awful regard, and exciting their attention. Otherwise how pitifully scant a draught those poor fishers of men had caught by the common allurements only of innocent life and rational discourse, I leave you to imagine. And where such extraordinary commendations are wanting, is it not reasonable that the need of them should be supplied by ordinary and probable expedients?”

Let the reader now observe how the argument stands. We have seen that the *principle* on which it is that

ishments, through the corruption of man, give rise to hypocrisy and secularity, is in its nature a legitimate principle, highly beneficial in its native motives, and, in its actual working, productive of advantages. But we are still only approaching to which is the direct and principal benefit intended by the establishment, namely, the providing the means of religious instruction for the whole people of a country. This benefit we come to, not only without being obliged to make deductions in respect of evils previously established, but rather with the advantage of a previous expediency already made out.

As regards Scotland, the most simple way of deciding the question of the benefit conferred by the establishment in respect to the means of religious instruction is to go back at once to the period of the reformation from Popery, when the establishment commenced. That we are entitled to view the question in this light is manifest, since the averment of opponents is not simply that the establishment is inefficient *now*, but that it is so absolutely, and from its very nature. It will not do to look complacently at Scotland, as we now find it covered over with churches and schools, the fruits of her establishment, and then to tell us that Scotland has no need of an establishment. Though there is no difficulty in arguing the question on this ground, it would be doing injustice to the subject, did we not remind the reader that the real question is, Would Scotland have been better without her Church Establishment from the year 1560 onwards? Any man, however, who looks with the degree of candour upon the state of the country.

at the time of the first Reformation, will be satisfied that there was far too little light diffused over the country to afford any reasonable prospect, that the people would of their own accord have made the requisite sacrifices, to maintain Protestant ministers, and to erect churches for them. The principle which has been so admirably illustrated by Dr Chalmers, of the supply in religion preceding the demand, is so obviously and strongly applicable to the case of Scotland at this period, that nothing but prejudice can prevent any one from seeing it immediately. Of course, if a man has made up his mind that an establishment is bad in principle, and contrary to the Word of God, he will feel compelled to maintain that Scotland, some how or other, would have been in a better state at this day, had the whole business of religious instruction, both in churches and schools, been from the first left to voluntary contribution. The idea, however, is ridiculous. Let the fact bear as it will upon the general principles of the question, it can admit of no reasonable doubt, that Scotland has been benefited to an incalculable extent by her Church Establishment, miserably insufficient as it has been from the time when Knox and his fellows protested against the alienation to the private use of the nobles, of the goods belonging to the kirk, the schools, and the poor, down to our own days, when it is with shameless effrontery asserted, that the robbery has all along been on the part of the church, because, forsooth, she has not given over into the hands of the people, property to which they never had the shadow of a right, and for which they have received ten thou-

and times its value, in the blessings of peace, security, liberty, and religion.*

But supposing we come down to the present day, and give our opponents the benefit of all that has been done for Scotland by the establishment, and the various institutions connected with it, no elaborate argument will be required to show the *present* expediency of the existing provision. Even if we should grant, (what is against all human probability,) that in some large towns, where a desire for Christian ordinances is in some measure general, and where wealth is added to a

* It has often been alleged by our opponents that the benefits of a Church Establishment are all ideal, and have never been realized. Let the reader compare the assertion with the following testimony of a Scottish Historian, which is now well known, and the faithfulness of which has never been called in question. Speaking of the year 1649, (his own times,) he says, "Now the ministry was notably purified, the magistracy altered, and the people strangely refined. Scotland hath been, even by emulous foreigners, called Philadelphia, and now she seemed to be in her flower." And of the period preceding 1660, he says: "I verily believe there were more souls converted to Christ in that short period of time, than in any other season since the Reformation, though of treble its duration; nor was there ever greater purity and plenty of the means of grace than was in that time. Every parish had a minister, every village had a school, every family almost had a Bible, yea, in most of the country, all the children of age could read the Scripture, and were provided of Bibles, either by their parents or their ministers. I have lived many years in a parish where I never heard an oath, and you might have rode many miles before you had heard any. Also, you would not, for a great part of the country, have lodged in a family where the Lord was not worshipped, by reading, singing, and prayer. Nobody complained more of our church government than our taverners, whose ordinary lamentation was, their trade was broke, people were become so sober.—*Kirkton's History of the Church of Scotland*, pp. 51, 61.

spirit of enterprise, the gospel would continue to be as well maintained as it is, were the establishment swept away, what man of sober thinking can believe that this would be the case in those numerous and extensive country districts where the people generally are poor, or where there is but little desire, for a proper dispensation of the gospel? Let any man consider calmly the difficulties which Dissenters frequently experience in supporting their own chapels, even in wealthy cities; the fact, that they seldom attempt to lay them down in those districts where they are chiefly needed, knowing that in these they could not be maintained; as also the difficulty with which funds are collected in the most wealthy and religious places, for the maintenance of important religious and charitable institutions;—let him consider these things in addition to the more obvious points of the case relating to the temporal and spiritual poverty of many parts of the country, and I see not how he can fail to stand in amazement at a proposal seriously made, that the national endowment be forthwith abolished; not taken from one body and given to another likely to make a better use of it, but turned to the civil purposes of the nation.

Our opponents will no doubt tell us of the assurance they entertain, that, if only that grand hindrance to liberality, an establishment, were removed, there would be ample provision, not only for all faithful ministers, but for all the religious and charitable institutions together. . . Credulous enthusiasm! How then comes it to pass, if such be the exhaustless energy of the voluntary principle, that, in America, the “income

of the different religious, charitable, missionary, bible, tract, education, and sunday school societies," is only "about 500,000 dollars annually," * that is, £112,500; while, in Britain, a sum twice as large is collected by some four or five of the *religious* societies alone? Allowing for a population in this country about double that of America, we shall still have as much collected by four or five of the societies in this country as by all the American institutions together. I mention not this to find fault with the Americans. I know well that they have too much to collect for the support of their clergy, to make the smallness of the sum a matter of much surprise. But the fact may be enough to throw merited contempt on those wild conjectures, upon the faith of which we are called to cast away our present resources, and commit ourselves to the mercies of private liberality. Supposing that the voluntary plan should do as much, but not more, for us than for America, then about £220,000 would, for the future, be the income of all our societies together. During the past year, the joint receipts of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Church Missionary, and the Wesleyan Missionary Societies, have amounted to no less a sum than £171,807.

They will point us farther to the liberality of the Apostolic churches, which they are accustomed to speak of, as if they had been marked by a perpetual openness of heart and hand, in connection with all that involved the interests of Christ's kingdom, and especially in connection with the due support of their pastors. I maintain that these representations are in

* Flint's View of the United States, p. 10.

direct contradiction to the apostolic writings. No doubt there were particular churches which, at some seasons in their history, were willing even beyond their means to pour into the treasury of the Lord. But, besides that nothing has been more common in every age of the church than seasons of liberality followed by times of coldness and selfishness, there were other churches during these very seasons, of which the apostles had to give a far different account,—to whose equity and generosity they were constrained to make reluctant appeals, reproving them for their selfishness, and urging them to greater liberality towards their teachers; while the writer himself sometimes submits to endure the severest privations, that he may be able to assume this tone, free from the imputation of unworthy motives. It shows a miserable want of taste to infer from the delicate manner in which Paul introduces difficulties like these, that they were of no very urgent or painful nature. As little good taste does it show, to take for granted that, because Paul cheerfully submitted for Christ's sake to labour "without any certain dwelling place," (as he himself speaks, while enumerating his trials,) to spend his time at manual labour rather than subject himself to the charge of selfish motives, and to enjoin on Christian ministers a hospitality which he himself was precluded from exercising,—that these were trifling evils in Paul's condition, as a minister having to look for his temporal support to the liberality of churches many of whose members were poor, and many others illiberal, suspicious, and narrow-minded. But if Paul was not free from difficulties of this nature, how much

ist they have pressed on that large class of (to which the great majority must in every ng,) who were distinguished by no very periority to command reverence, and thus em from the effects of selfishness. A single the epistle to the Philippians might be enough rest for ever the talk of which we hear about the unbounded liberality of the early 'I have no man like-minded who will naturally your state. For all seek their own, not the hich are Jesus Christ's." *

would be wrong to draw the argument from cy to a close, without referring briefly to two special points in the situation of this country, hile they combine to put the matter of ex- still farther beyond all reasonable doubt, do heavy responsibility on the head of those who, ent with expressing doubts upon a subject on en to express doubt in times like these is matter, have actually treated the affair as if out the grossest prejudice could lead any man from them. First, then, I observe that tion is, Whether means of usefulness that exist, and have long existed in this country, swept away. The question is not, whether o plans would be the more expedient, suppos- er to have hitherto been adopted. But the e case being, that there already exist about a parish churches in Scotland supported by nd a very considerable number of churches

* Phil. ii. 20, 21.

called parliamentary, supported by national grant, the proposal of our opponents is, that these funds shall forthwith be taken away. It is to be observed, secondly, that by far the greatest part of the funds that go to the support of religion in Scotland, actually do not touch the property of any individual in the country. Those got value for them who became bound to pay them. This I do not here adduce to show the essential injustice of overthrowing the establishment; but simply to show what strength of a case our opponents must exhibit, if they would prove the expediency of their proposal. Unless the establishment be wrong in point of *principle*, their cause will never bear a hearing on the ground of expediency. But there is still a third circumstance, perhaps the most important of all, which combines with the two preceding in demanding of our opponents a case of no dubious nature, but one most clear and decisive. It can hardly be doubted by any one who looks at the state of parties in the country, that, whatever influence religious Dissenters might have in procuring the removal of the national endowment, they would have chiefly as the instruments of a party far stronger than they, whose aim is nothing less than "to break God's bands asunder, and to cast away his cords from them;" in other words, to sever religion utterly from the affairs of the kingdom. If this party do but succeed in getting the State broken off from the Church in respect of pecuniary aid, who can imagine that either root or branch of a just connection between religion and the management of the empire will be allowed to remain? The distinction between the

support of the teachers of religion, and such other fruits of a State alliance as the opening of national assemblies, legislative and judicial, with prayer, days of public humiliation and thanksgiving, laws for the protection of the Sabbath, and the teaching of religion in national schools,—the distinction between these things and the support of the teachers of religion, is far too nice even for most good men to see ; certainly it will prove too nice to make much impression upon freethinkers : and thus will it come to pass, gradually it may be, yet surely, that there shall not be left to the country so much as one public recognition of the God “who ruleth in the kingdoms of men,” or of that Divine Mediator, under whose feet these kingdoms have been put, and who “hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, “KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.”

Our opponents, then, having failed to make out a proof of inexpediency at all, much more to make out that clear and decisive case which they were bound to establish, what remains, but that we now revert with increased confidence to our general scripture principles, and affirm that, on the ground of these, it is the duty of our civil rulers to endow the church ; and that, in regard to the expediency of the matter, while we do not imagine on the one hand that an establishment will of itself secure the prosperity of religion, we do hold confidently on the other, that, as the Church of Christ on earth needs pecuniary aid for her preservation and enlargement, so it is both reasonable, and well fitted to promote the interests of the church, as well as of civil society, to have the requisite aid

secured by the legislature, which is best able to it,—to have it *so* secured, as shall leave the Church once independent of the State in her ecclesiastical and safe from the dangers to which she must be posed, if left dependent upon the good-will of her friends, the caprice of her professed ones, an ever-varying circumstances, feelings, and judgment of both.

The subject of the remaining Section, which relates to the alleged injustice of endowing the Church of land exclusively, and making all other bodies contribute to her support, will require only a very consideration.

SECTION III.

The Allegation, That it is unjust to endow the Church of Scotland exclusively ; and still more to make all other bodies of Christians contribute to her support.

meeting the first of the two statements into which averment divides itself—that it is unjust to endow the Church of Scotland exclusively—I would not wish to be considered as defending mere abstract principles, independently of circumstances. Cases may perhaps be conceived, where it would be impracticable for the legislature of a country to endow the church wholly, without, on the one hand, endowing all sects, thus giving support to the most pestilential heresies, or, on the other, sacrificing by an exclusive endowment that very welfare of the church and the country at large, which the endowment is designed to promote. Suppose, for illustration, that at the commencement of the American confederation, it had been proposed to endow the Christian church throughout the union. To say the least, the difficulty must have been very great of avoiding the endowment of all sects on the one hand, and on the other the creation of enmities and ruinous animosities, by the attempt to select one or more out of the numerous bodies that were in the field. Circumstances in our own country were as favorable as possible, when the Church of Scotland was first endowed. With the exception of the Church of

Rome (whose system it was one express design that endowment to root out.) there was in fact no sect of any note to put in either an additional or counter claim. The difficulty, therefore, of making just selection out of a number of claims, each of considerable strength, had, in our case, no existence: as all that we now require to show is, that in this country where the practical difficulties which may be apt to attend selection, have already been got over, there are sufficient reasons of principle and utility against extending the endowment to dissenters. If such reasons can be assigned, then it is in vain to charge the exclusive endowment with injustice; the limitation to one body being in that case no act of *partiality*, but a thing necessary for that well-being of the church and the nation, which it is the design of a State endowment to promote. It ought to be carefully observed that this is not the case of a natural civil right, to which all have an equal claim as peaceable subjects of the same government. The endowment of the church is a special privilege conferred in order to certain great practical ends: and it lies beyond doubt with the State to fix the limits of the privilege, according to an enlightened consideration of the question, What course is both consistent with principle, and most subservient to the great ends in view? If, in the circumstances of the case, it be found incompatible with these ends, to endow the body of professing Christians to which you belong, no injustice is done you by the mere conferring of the privilege on another body, whose claims to support are in themselves good, and independent of yours. In consequence of this, you may accidentally

be subjected to certain inconveniences ; but this is only what individuals in a country ought to be prepared for, satisfied if they receive a recompense in the general good.

Well ; the reasons which oppose themselves to the endowment of Dissenters from the Church of Scotland may be stated in a few words. I shall suppose for a moment that the legislature were willing, and that they even found it practicable to exclude from the endowment those heretical sects, which it were absolutely, and, in all circumstances, unlawful to promote. The legislature must then proceed, in endowing orthodox Dissenters, upon one of two grounds ; either, *first*, that, having weighed the reasons of dissent in each case, it judges them sufficient ; or, *secondly*, that, without entering at all into that question, Dissenters in general are entitled to a share in the national endowment, supposing their doctrinal principles to be in the main correct. The former ground is scarcely deserving of a remark. . Not only does it suppose the State to pronounce a sentence of condemnation upon the very body which it continues to support, in each instance where the dissent is found justifiable, and the endowment granted, but it supposes the State to engage in a labour of such magnitude, endurance and perplexity, as would be wholly incompatible with the discharge of its civil duties, and could only after all devolve upon the leading men in some one of the sects already endowed. As to the second ground, namely, that without considering the reasons of separation, Dissenters in general ought to receive a share in the endowment, provided their doctrinal principles be in

the main correct, it is a fatal objection to this principle, that it consecrates sectarianism by a law. It strikes a mortal blow at every thing like unity in the church, by assuring schismatics, that, however unreasonable their dissent may be, they have only to form a party, behave decently, and abstain from uttering heretical opinions, and the State will countenance and uphold them. It is true, that without proceeding upon any such general principles, small endowments have been given to some of the Dissenters both in England and Ireland. But the times are changed; and the charge of injustice could not be avoided, without proceeding avowedly upon some such general principles, as those which have been referred to.

In these remarks, however, I have supposed a practical difficulty got over, which it requires no great sagacity to perceive, could not possibly be overcome, and which would of itself afford work enough for the legislature, though it had nothing else to do. I refer to the difficulty of determining what degree of doctrinal error ought to preclude a sect from the benefit of the endowment. No man who knows any thing of the spirit of the age can doubt, that if once it be agreed to shut out those only who maintain what is termed fundamental error, few sects indeed will be excluded. It is easy to speak of endowing only orthodox Dissenters; to act upon it is plainly impracticable. Whatever jealousy the endowment of the church excites at present, would be multiplied an hundred fold, by any attempt to bring in some of the sects, without bringing all in together. I conclude,

therefore, that since the exclusive endowment of the Church of Scotland is no act of partiality, but a thing justified by powerful reasons of principle and of utility, the charge of injustice is without foundation. In this light, I persuade myself, the matter will appear to all but those who are either favourable on the one hand to the endowment of all sects whatever, or on the other, to the abandonment of the church to the good will of the people. Happily, the position which Dissenters in Scotland have assumed, has rendered controversy on this part of the subject almost superfluous: and it must be apparent to all considerate persons that practically the question is,—not, shall there be an endowment of the Church of Scotland only, or an endowment of all orthodox sects, but shall there be an endowment of the Church of Scotland only upon the one hand, or, on the other, either no national endowment of the church at all, or an endowment of all sects whatever, as in France. The support of all sects is utterly unjustifiable on principle: that the church ought not to be abandoned to the good-will of the people, we here suppose to have been already proved. It remains, therefore, that the endowment should continue on its present footing.

But it is next alleged, and that not only with great confidence, but in a high tone of indignation, that injustice is done to other bodies of Christians in requiring them to contribute to the support of the Church of Scotland. The argument here is stated by Mr Balantyne with as much plausibility as by any other writer I have met with. “The venerable Dr Chalmers,” says this writer, “is reported to have stated

on another occasion, that Dissenters and other non-adherents of Ecclesiastical Establishments, may lawfully contribute to maintain these institutions, under the Roman Emperors—even under Nero himself—the early Christians paid taxes, part of which was no doubt applied to support the national idolatry. But this is very dexterously to mistake the question altogether. The question is not, May people, in certain circumstances, lawfully submit to persecution?—may lawfully submit to ‘suffer for righteousness sake.’ About this there is no doubt; and there never was doubt. The question is, Is it lawful for their persecutors to inflict such sufferings upon them? The apostle Paul not only submitted to pay taxes under the Roman government, part of which was, no doubt, applied to maintain the established superstitions; but submitted to evils, which, if not greater, were at least more glaring and undisguised. ‘Even unto this present hour,’ says he, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, ‘we both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place: And labour, working with our hands;—being reviled, and blessed; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat: We are counted as the filth of the world, as the offscourings of all things unto this day.’ And in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he says, ‘(the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one) thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned. Paul, in the circumstances in which he was placed, submitted to all these evils; and he enjoined his brethren, in similar circumstances, to do the same. But was it lawful for any to subject either him or

them to such inflictions? This is the only question concerned in the controversy, and we should like to hear Dr Chalmers answer it.*

The answer to this question is quite a simple one. But before proceeding to it, let the reader in the first place carefully observe Mr Ballantyne's admission, that Dissenters are not called to do any thing unlawful in paying taxes which go to the support of an establishment, supposing it were as bad as heathen idolatry. Whatever sin the State may be supposed to commit in calling them to pay these taxes, it is no sin in them to pay them: it is but giving "tribute to whom tribute is due." Mr Ballantyne was quite aware that to assert the unlawfulness of the Dissenters' *paying* taxes for the support of an establishment, had been to charge the Apostles with the guilt of immorality. But if Dissenters are not called to commit sin, or act contrary to their conscience in paying taxes for the support of an establishment, what means their perpetual language about the violation of the rights of conscience? A violation of the rights of a man's conscience which does not require him to act contrary to his conscience, is a mere absurdity. It is ridiculous to speak of the violation of Paul's rights of conscience, in his being required to pay a tax, which he not only paid in point of fact, but enjoined his fellow Christians to pay, "not only for wrath, but for *conscience*' sake." Beyond doubt, it grieved the Apostle to think that any part of his property should be expended in supporting idolatry; but it would no less

* Ballantyne's Comparison, pp. 66, 67.

grieve him to think that the property of the heathens themselves should be expended for this purpose. If a violation of the rights of his conscience had been involved in the matter, it is certain that he would not have submitted to it. Though Mr Ballantyne, therefore, does not in so many words admit that there was no violation of the rights of conscience in the case of the early Christians, he admits the very same thing, when he allows that, whatever sin there was in the matter, was the sin not of the Christians in paying, but of the emperor in exacting the tax. "The question" (I requote his words) "is not, May people in certain circumstances, lawfully submit to persecution?—May lawfully submit to suffer for righteousness sake?*" About this there is no doubt; and there never was a doubt. The question is, Is it lawful for their persecutors to inflict such sufferings upon them?"

To this question we now proceed; and the answer is simple. It was not lawful for the emperors to tax the Christians, *or to tax anybody*, for the support of iniquity. But another question remains, Where did the emperor's sin lie in thus taxing the Christians? Did the sinfulness of the act turn on this, that the Christians *believed* the system of heathen idolatry to be false, and on that simple ground could not justly be taxed for its support? or, did its sinfulness turn on

* This question, by the way, is stated with gross unfairness. The words *persecution*, and *suffering for righteousness sake*, naturally suggest to the reader the idea of a command laid upon the early Christians, which they felt it unlawful to obey, and for disobedience to which they were punished. I need not say the case was far different in this matter of taxation.

this, that the system of heathen idolatry was in *point of fact* false, detestable, and contrary to these laws of natural religion and of Christianity, which the emperors themselves, as well as the Christians, were bound to know and to obey. Without fear of contradiction I assert, that there was either no sin in the matter at all, or that *the last* was the true and only ground of sinfulness. And on this ground, it was not the Christians alone whom it was unlawful to tax for the purpose in question; it was unlawful to tax the idolaters themselves. If you allege, on the other hand, that the sinfulness of the act turned on this, that the Christians *believed* the system false, it immediately follows, that the justice of any tax imposed upon a man turns on his approval of the purposes to which it is to be applied: and so there is an end to all government. The matter would come just to this, that, whatever may be the duty of the subject when required to pay a tax, (it has been allowed to be no sin in him to pay it, whatever purpose the State may have in view,) it is, however, unlawful in the magistrate to require payment from any man, without ascertaining that the object meets his approval.

Mr Ballantyne was well aware of this difficulty; and he endeavours to make his escape by laying down a distinction, which, although manifestly and purely arbitrary, seems to be the favourite refuge of the writers upon the other side. The following are his words: "It must be observed, however, that when I speak of persecution and the violation of conscience, I refer exclusively to what is extorted for *things religious*. Were a person to plead the convictions of conscience to exempt him from

contributing to uphold a national army, a national navy, or a national judicatory, it is quite manifest that his plea could not be admitted. Society would be at an end were such claims listened to. It is not the *demands* of conscience that I urge, but its *privileges*—it is not its *claims*, but its *rights*. These things our adversaries are eager to confound, that amidst the confusion their cause may escape. As the magistrate, they tell us, is warranted to compel people to support a national army, &c., although their conscience disapprove of it, and, instead of receiving benefit from it, they may actually receive hurt, so he is warranted to compel people to support a national religion though their conscience disapprove of it, and, instead of receiving benefit from it, they may receive hurt. They may just as well argue, that as the magistrate is warranted to compel people to attend in his courts at Westminster, he is also warranted to compel them to attend in his chapel at Windsor; or, because he is warranted to compel people to obey the legal opinions of his *judges*, he is also warranted to compel them to obey the religious opinions of his *bishops*. In other words, because he is warranted to compel their submission in things *secular*, he is also warranted to compel their submission in things *sacred*.”*

The greater part of the above paragraph is merely Mr Ballantyne's assertion of this supposed distinction in the matter of taxation between things *secular* and things *sacred*. The argument by which he justifies it is in the last part of the paragraph,

* Ballantyne's Comparison, pp. 62—63.

“They may as well argue, &c.” The simple answer to the argument is this. If, by “obeying the legal opinions of the judges,” be meant adopting their opinions, the magistrate is no more entitled to compel the subject to this, than to compel him to “obey,” or adopt “the religious opinions of his bishops.” Conscience would be just as really violated in the one case as in the other. If, on the other hand, by “obeying the legal opinions of the judges,” be meant merely submitting our *property* to the operation of them, where is the propriety of instituting a comparison between this, and “obeying the religious opinions of the king’s bishops?” The same thing may be said of the other comparison between compelling a man to attend the magistrate’s chapel, and compelling him to attend his courts at Westminster. If attending these courts implied the adopting or sanctioning of the judges’ opinions, then it were as really sinful for a man who happened to differ from the judges, to attend them, and for the magistrate to require his attendance, as it would be for a person differing from the magistrate in religion, to attend his chapel, or for the magistrate to require his attendance. In both cases there would be a compromise of principle, and that would be the proper ground of sinfulness in both. But if attendance at the courts of Westminster do not imply (as every one knows that it does not) any compromise of a man’s principles with respect to the civil matter in dispute, then how can a comparison be at all instituted between such attendance, and attendance at the king’s chapel, which is of course adduced here as a thing involving compromise of religious principle?

In short, it is manifest that, if it be lawful for the magistrate to take any thing to do with the promoting of religion, the distinction between a tax in reference to things secular and things sacred, is utterly without foundation. Whatever object falls within the province of the civil ruler, must be a proper ground of taxation and it is absurd to talk of the magistrate in any case whatever taxing those only who agree with him in opinion. Either the magistrate has no right to promote religion in his official character, or he has. If he has a right, it can only be enforced by national taxation. If it be unlawful for him to enforce his right in any given case, and the formal reason of the unlawfulness be, that the subject differs from him in religion then there is an end to all government.

I need scarcely draw the inference from all this regarding the sin of the emperors in taxing the Christian for the support of idolatry, that it did not lie in their differing in opinion from the emperors, but could only lie in this, that the system which they were taxed to support, was in fact detestable, and ought to have been known by the emperors to be such. *A fortiori*, the legislature of this country commits no injustice in taxing dissenters for the support of the Established Church, on the mere ground that they conscientiously disclaim its ministrations. If there be sin in the matter, it must lie in this, that the principles of the establishment are in point of fact unworthy of support and ought to be known by the legislature so to be. Betake yourself to proof on this head, and you are at most legitimate ground; and if the point can be made out, then neither you nor we ought to be taxed for the

port of the establishment. As to your disclaiming principles of the Established Church, it has nothing whatever to do with the question.

Fearful is the weight of guilt which must lie upon the head of those men, especially those Christian Ministers, who shall persist in endeavouring to rouse the popular mind a spirit of opposition to the Ecclesiastical establishment on the ground that has been under review. Far be it from us to intimate, that the question of Church Establishments is not a legitimate subject of free public discussion. And if our opponents would keep within the limits of a fair and manly attempt to prove Church Establishments generally, or our own in particular, worthy of support, however much we might differ from them, we should cheerfully acknowledge their right to make the attempt. But to agitate the popular mind, especially in times like the present, on such a ground as this which Dissenters have in fact assumed, and to persist in asserting openly, confidently, and with the sanction and weight of the ministerial character, that it is unjust to lay a tax upon any one for support of religious ministrations which he disavows, *simply because he disavows them*,—this is at once reprehensible in the face of Apostolic example and precept, and, in its direct tendency, subversive of all Government. No refined, arbitrary distinctions will avert the mischief which such a principle, diffused among the people by men whom they are taught to regard with respect, is fitted to produce. There are multitudes in the country, the enemies of religion and good order, to whom, doubtless, the principle will prove

highly congenial ; and they will hail it with triumph glad that their unrighteous hopes are at length less unlikely to be realized, through the accession to their cause of a class in society, where they had little thought to find support to their principles.

Concluding Remarks on Two Popular Objections.

Before drawing the whole argument to a close, I am desirous to advert briefly to two objections which have not been considered formally in the preceding pages. The one of them is this : " If the magistrate be bound to support religion, he must be bound to support a false religion, if his own happen to be false. But this is monstrous ; therefore he ought to support no religion." This argument may very easily be reduced to an absurdity. With precisely the same force I might argue thus : If parents be bound to teach their children religion, they must be bound to teach them a false religion, if their own happen to be false : therefore parents are not bound to teach religion to their children. Or, thus : if one man be bound to employ the principle of habit to confirm his mind in truth, another must be bound to employ the same principle to confirm his in error, if he happen to be in error : therefore it is unlawful to employ the principle of habit at all. Or this : if we are bound to employ voluntary contributions in support of Christianity, Pagans must be bound to employ them in support of Paganism : therefore voluntary contributions cannot lawfully be employed at all. It is needless to multiply examples. The argument manifestly involves an absurdity which, expressed in

general terms, is this, that, because the talents with which God may have intrusted us in our several stations are liable, through ignorance, to be abused, they must therefore be buried in the earth. The magistrate's duty, like that of the private individual, is to know and support the truth : and the only inference which he can legitimately draw from the case of those who, with an ill-informed conscience, conscientiously support falsehood, is, that he is bound to take the greater care to have *his* conscience rightly informed. In connection, however, with the bearing of this objection upon particular cases, it may be well to keep in mind, that, along with mischievous errors in the religion of a country, the support of which, viewed by themselves, can on no principle be lawful, there may be mixed up important truths of natural or revealed religion, the maintenance of which is not merely lawful, but matter of duty, independently of the accompanying errors. The heathen establishments, for example, contained a national protest against Atheism, and a recognition of divine providence ; and in so far they were both justifiable and worthy of praise.

The other objection to which I have to advert in conclusion is this,—that an establishment implies *a tyrannical dictation of faith to the community*. We utterly deny the charge. If the government of a country be despotic, its religious establishment will of course bear the marks of tyranny, like the other national institutions. This, however, is not the fault of the establishment, but of the nature of the government. The matter is simply this. The legislature, satisfied of the duty and necessity of providing means for the

support of religion, together with the folly and criminality of supporting every thing which may call religion, thereupon decides what is faith which is worthy of the national countenance; just as an individual, before giving a his property for the support of religion, make up his mind as to the faith which is worth to receive it: or as the legislature, before giving away the public money for a college, or a bridge, an hospital, will first ascertain that the object serves national countenance. There is no prescription to the faith of others in any one of these cases. The legislature, in endowing the church, does not force to adopt the creed which it sanctions, any more than it obliges me to approve of other objects to which it may see meet to devote the national funds. But this is not all. Supposing the country to be free (and if it is not, that is not the fault of an establishment), the legislature, even in determining what faith deserves support, expresses not only its own judgment, that of the community,—not, it may be, of the whole but of that part, whatever it be, to whose the ultimate appeal is made in *other matters*. It has been asked with triumph, whether it be the judgment of the rulers, or that of the country, that is to fix the religion to be established. We answer without hesitation that it is *both*. It results from the very nature of a free government, that in this, as in every other great public affair, the judgment of the legislature, and that of the community must, in the end, be one and the same.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A. p. 23.

THE following passages are extracted from the work of the late Rev. Mr Ballantyne, entitled, "Comparison of Established and Dissenting Churches." Pp. 42—49.

"Would people only look to the simple facts of the case, there are few, we are persuaded, but would admit that it is a branch of the *Magistrate's* office to attend to the *interests of religion*. We do not mean, that they would generally agree about the nature and extent of the attention he should pay; but, on the general question itself, we are convinced, there would almost be entire unanimity. — In every case, we imagine, he has the full right to *do all the good, secular and sacred*, that he justly can, provided, as already remarked, it be *real good*, and not merely the *semblance* of it. In conceding to him this privilege, we are merely conceding a right which seems inseparable from every human being—the right which all have, in their proper station, to do the utmost degree of good in their power.

"Some have even maintained, that religion is the principal end of the *Magistrate's* office, or, at least, that it is the principal object of the civil community over which he presides.—But even though secular interests were allowed to be the proper objects of the *Magistrate's* concern, it would nevertheless appear that religion is fairly within his province; for of all the means he can employ for promoting our secular good, religion will be found the most efficacious.—We confess, however, we see no propriety in regarding the *Magistrate's* concern with religion, as dependent on its subserviency to *temporal* things. Religion is of the utmost importance on its own account; and for the sake of our spiritual good, we conceive, he should promote it. Unless we take this view of his duty, we must either condemn a number of the most useful of his laws, or resort to the most childish refinements, in order to justify them.

"Neither is it of any use to allege, that the proper weapon of the *Magistrate* is *force*, and that this is altogether inapplicable to religion. Every person will admit, that it is useless for such a purpose; but there is evidently no occasion for his resorting to it. If the *Magistrate* wish to promote any object, he must obviously employ the

means which are adapted to its nature and the circumstances with which it is connected, and not those that are utterly unsuitable. In affording protection, he must employ *protective*, or *coercive* means—in promoting agriculture, he must employ agricultural means—medicine he must promote by medical means—and why should he not promote religion by religious means? It would certainly be preposterous to employ the sword or the gibbet to teach us religion—just as preposterous as to employ a psalm or a sermon to repel the aggressions of a conqueror, or punish the criminality of a murderer; but where is the necessity of the Magistrate's acting so absurdly? May he not adopt enlightened and rational measures, in regard to religion, as well as in regard to trade or commerce?

"The objections to the Magistrate's concern with religion arise entirely, we are persuaded, from the abuse that has often been made of his power.—In short, though the Magistrate's power in religion has been often misapplied—sometimes, there can be no doubt, from mere ignorance—yet in itself it is of the utmost importance, and, if properly directed, would lead to the most important benefits. But to what extent should the Magistrate interfere with religion, so as to promote its good? This is a much more practical question than the preceding, and involves considerations which merit the highest attention," &c.

The following is from the Theology of Dwight. Sermon cxiv., at the close.

"The only remark which I shall annex to this Discourse, is, that, connected with the preceding one, it shows, unanswerably, the groundlessness and folly of an observation, repeated proverbially by multitudes of men in this and other countries; viz. that *religion has nothing to do with politics*, or, in other words, with *government*.

"These Discourses, summarily as the subjects of them have been considered, prove beyond all reasonable debate, that the whole vindicable conduct of rulers towards their subjects, and of subjects towards their rulers, is nothing but a mere collection of duties, objects of moral obligation, required by God, and indispensably owed to him by men. The Christian religion, therefore, the rule of duty, and involving all moral obligation, is so far from having nothing to do with this subject, that it is inseparably interwoven with every part of it. Accordingly, the Bible regulates, and, were it not sinfully prevented from its proper influence, would exactly and entirely control, all the political doctrines and actions of men. It is, indeed, as easy and as common to deny truth, and refuse to perform our duty, to disobey God, and injure men, in political concerns, as in any other.

In truth, there has been no field of iniquity more extensive than this; none in which more enormous crimes or more terrible sufferings have existed. All these crimes and sufferings have sprung from the ignorance of, or disobedience to the Scriptures. Were *they* allowed to govern the political conduct of mankind, both the crimes and the sufferings would vanish; every duty, both of rulers and subjects, would be performed, and every interest would be completely secured. In what manner the doctrine against which I am contending ever came to be received by any man, who was not peculiarly weak or wicked, I am at a loss to determine. It would seem, that even the careless and gross examination of the most heedless reflector must have evinced both its folly and falsehood. A dream is not more unfounded; the decisions of frenzy are not more wild. To villains in power, or in pursuit of power, office, and public plunder, it is undoubtedly a most convenient doctrine; as it will quiet the reproaches of conscience, where conscience has not ceased to reproach; and throw the gate which opens to every crime and selfish gratification from its hinges. To subjects, to a state, to a nation, it is literally fatal. The people which have adopted it, may be certainly pronounced to have bidden a final adieu to its peace and its happiness, its virtue and its safety."

NOTE B. p. 27.

In the *Eclectic Review* for April, 1832, the Reviewer, after a quotation from Dr Wardlaw's *Work on the Sabbath*, has these words, p. 303. "With these excellent sentiments, our own are in entire unison. The only difference between the much respected Author and ourselves, lies, we apprehend, in the mode of defining the distinct province and duty of the Legislature. Dr Wardlaw thinks, that only the secular ends of the Sabbath can be reached, or ought to be referred to, by human laws. We should prefer to say, the secular observance only of the Sabbath can be enforced by the civil magistracy; but even the political benefits of the Sabbath are inseparably connected with its highest ends. The legislator is not required to shut his eyes to the broad fact, that it is for the interest of the State that men should be religious; and he must know, or ought to know, that the Sabbath has been given by the Creator for religious ends, and has ever been the bulwark of religion. He must be aware too that only in proportion as the ultimate, spiritual ends of the Sabbath are attained by the devout observance of the day, the moral advantages and secular

benefits of the Institution to the community are likely to be realized. Thus, as a politician, he has a direct interest in the day's being religiously observed. Without going out of his sphere, then, he may and ought to have regard to those spiritual ends of the Institution. For instance, if he closes the theatre on the Sabbath, it is not in order to promote the secular ends of the Sabbath, but to prevent its sanctity from desecration; and in interfering 'for the protection from all unnecessary interruption and annoyance of those who choose to devote the day to its more appropriate end,'—which is confessedly his province,—he still must have his eyes open to the spiritual ends for which the Sabbath has been instituted. We can have no objection to the position, that the *department* of the magistrate is purely secular; and this is, we believe, all that Dr Wardlaw intends. His department is, the protection of men's personal rights and social interests, civil and religious. Civil protection may be considered as a secular end; it is as a *law of protection*, that the Sabbath claims to be politically enforced. But, in protecting men in their religious rights and privileges, the magistrate is directly promoting, in the best possible way, the cause of religion and morality; and it is surely desirable that this should be his aim and intention. With a writer in the North American Review, we join in expressing the conviction, 'that the people of the United States'—of this—of any country—'have nothing better, in regard to their political concerns, to hope or wish for, than that all their agents' (and rulers) 'should be influenced in the exercise of temporal power by religious belief.' And in the language of the Report of the general Union for promoting the Sabbath in the United States, we will add: 'We trust that the improved moral sense of the nation, sanctified by the influences of Christianity, will yet exert a benign influence on the national councils, leading our legislators to believe, that the permanency of our invaluable institutions, and the stability of our laws, depend upon a solemn recognition and devout observance of the laws of that great Being who was our fathers' God, and who will be the God of our posterity, until they shall voluntarily throw off all allegiance to him.'"

ERRATA.

Page 15, line 5 of note, for *soon* read *sooner*.

— 31, line 11, dele *distinct*, and,

— 30, line 9 of note, transfer [""] to the end of the note.

— 66, dele the note.

NOV 19 1968

